

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ROBINSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until Monday, June 3, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

George A. Gordon to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Haiti.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Harry N. Pharr to be a member, Mississippi River Commission.

POSTMASTERS

MISSOURI

Howard L. Stephens, Eldon.
Carl E. Latimer, Frankford.
Oren Simpson, Richland.
Thomas W. Withrow, Troy.

NORTH CAROLINA

Henry A. McNeely, China Grove.
Ferdie B. Johnson, Clinton.
James O. Purnell, Franklinton.
Patrick N. Gallagher, Nazareth.
Fletcher C. Mann, Pittsboro.
Marguerite W. Maddrey, Seaboard.
Duncan F. McGougan, Tabor City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Clerk, Hon. South Trimble, who read the following communication:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1935.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN J. O'CONNOR, of New York, to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS, Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, we pray that we may feel Thy presence, disturbing us with elevated thoughts and with that sublime sense that we should be something other than what we are. So abide with us that we may reach out to larger realities and thus reflect in our personality the likeness of our Creator. As the right must be defended and the wrong defied, grant that our convictions may struggle on toward open expression. Basing our primary duty on loving and serving Thee, Heavenly Father, beckon us on, for other foundation can no man lay. Open our understanding, dwell in our hearts, that we may deeply sympathize with the faults and failures of others. Let it become the ruling passion of the strong to help the weak, the wise the foolish, the rich the poor, and the good the bad. Shield us all from the polluting hand of sin, harmonize our thoughts with Thy thoughts and our ways with Thy ways, and Thine will be the glory. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 29, 1935, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to rescind the action of the Vice President and Speaker in signing S. 2105, "An act to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes."

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was accepted:

MAY 28, 1935.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Speaker House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNS: Because of my appointment as United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, I hereby tender my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, effective June 2, 1935.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL L. IGOE.

ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THOSE HERE ILLEGALLY

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some statements and figures in relation to immigration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know what those figures pertain to and how much of the RECORD it will take.

Mr. DIES. Not much; about a page or a page and a half.

Mr. RICH. I think that is too much.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Texas has been for years looking up this question, and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make the following statement:

In my speech of May 20 I gave some figures in reference to Mexican population and immigration which were not complete. It is my desire at this time to set forth these figures in more detail.

In 1900 we had about 103,000 Mexicans in the United States. In 1930 we had approximately 1,422,533 Mexicans, according to the census of 1930. This included the foreign-born and native-born Mexicans. It did not include all of the Mexicans who were illegally in the United States, because this class of aliens avoid the census enumerators. In the absence of a law requiring the registration and fingerprinting of aliens, it is impossible to accurately determine how many aliens are in the country. However, we can arrive at a fairly accurate figure by taking into consideration a number of known factors. For instance, the 1930 census shows 805,535 native-born Mexicans in the United States and 616,998 foreign-born Mexicans residing in the United States. Between 1900 and 1930 there were 698,146 Mexicans born in the United States who were not older than 29 years on April 1, 1930. Of this number, 351,209 were male and 346,937 were female. Of the foreign-born Mexicans 348,782 were males and 268,216 were females.

In 1900 there were about 103,345 Mexicans residing in the United States. While we have no definite figures we may assume that half of them were foreign born and half of them were native born. If we deduct 51,500, being the number of native-born Mexicans residing in the United States in 1900, from the 805,535 native-born Mexicans residing in the United States in 1930, we have 754,035 Mexicans who were born in this country from 1900 to 1930. The parents of these 754,035 native-born Mexicans were either foreign born or native born. Most of the parents must have been foreign born, because there were 698,146 native-born Mexicans who range in ages from infancy to 29 years of age, and who were born between 1900 and 1930. Five

hundred and fifty-two thousand four hundred and eighty of such native-born Mexicans were born since 1920. This is proven by your 1920 census, which shows that there were 252,045 native-born Mexicans in the United States at that time. So that the 552,480 native-born Mexicans who were born between 1920 and 1930 could not have been old enough to be parents of any children. The census shows 162,280 native-born Mexicans in the United States in 1910, so that 633,235 Mexicans were born from 1910 to 1930. None of these Mexicans could have been over 20 years of age, and 552,480 could not have been over 10 years of age. It is, therefore, evident that the majority of native-born Mexicans were the children of foreign-born Mexicans who came to the United States from 1900 to 1930.

According to the Census Bureau there were 238,077 female Mexicans, including foreign born and native born who were married up to 1930. A much smaller number were married up to 1920 and a still smaller number were married up to 1910.

From the above figures we may account for the 754,000 Mexicans born in the United States from 1900 to 1930 by assuming they were the children of Mexicans who entered the United States illegally or that the Mexican women are prolific to a remarkable extent. There would, of course, be no record of such illegal entrants, either in the Immigration Bureau or the Census Department. The Secretary of Labor, in 1929, said:

We estimate that more than 1,000,000 Mexicans are illegally in this country.

The Secretary was in a better position to estimate the number of Mexicans illegally in this country than anyone else.

Roy L. Garis conducted studies in 1929 at the request of the Immigration Committee in reference to Mexican immigrants. He says, among other things:

How many—

Meaning Mexicans—

have waded the Rio Grande is a matter of conjecture, for many Mexicans prefer to enter without the formality of passing through the immigration offices for the simple reason that the head tax and other charges are high, to say nothing of their ability, or rather inability, to pass the literacy test. Many Mexicans who state to our immigration officials that they wish to cross the border merely to shop in American stores simply fail to return to Mexico. It seems to be thus that many of them enter this country illegally.

In this connection it is interesting to note that, according to the Census Bureau, the total number of illiterate Mexicans in the Texas population 10 years old and over was 163,622, or 33.8 percent. For the entire State of Texas the total number of illiterates was 308,021, or 6.8 percent.

Continuing from the report of Mr. Garis, we find this startling statement:

Some of those working with Mexicans say that for every one who enters legally there are three who enter illegally.

Speaking of the illiteracy among the Mexicans, Mr. Garis has the following to say:

According to their last census, only 3,000,000 persons in a population of 15,000,000 could both read and write, while over 7,000,000 Mexicans, 12 years of age or over, could neither read nor write.

Since only one-fifth of their population could read and write, it is reasonable to assume that not more than one-fifth of the Mexicans who entered the United States could pass the literacy test and enter the country legally. Former Attorney General U. S. Webb, of California, addressed a communication to Secretary of Labor Davis some time ago in which he cited many cases to prove that the average Mexican immigrant is ineligible to citizenship in the United States and hence should be excluded from admission into this country under the ineligibility provision in the Immigration Act of 1924.

On December 28, 1928, Secretary of Labor Davis stated:

In connection with the marked increase during the years 1923 and 1924 it may be noted that numbers of Mexicans multiplied in spite of the fact that every feasible attempt was being made to bring about a more strict enforcement of the law on the border, and the increased immigration in those years is simply another indication of the fact that the provisions of the law relative to

illiteracy, physical condition, etc., afford no adequate barriers so far as numbers are concerned.

In the case *In re Camille* the court held that a person of half white and half Indian blood is not a white person within the meaning of the phrases as used in the naturalization laws. The father of this person was a white Canadian and his mother an Indian woman of British Columbia, and he was, therefore, of half Indian blood. In the case of *In re Burton* the court held that an Indian born in British Columbia cannot be admitted to citizenship by naturalization of the United States.

Mr. Garis says:

Today, therefore, the population of pure Indian blood or of mixed Indian blood outnumbers very greatly the pure European stock. * * * It is evident, however, from what has been written, that the stock of the Mexican population is principally of mixed Indian blood.

Since this is true, many authorities believe that the vast majority of the population living in the nonquota countries to the south of us are ineligible for citizenship. Mr. Garis says:

It is difficult to see how the court could hold otherwise except in the case of those persons living there who can properly be designated as "white" or "Caucasian", the burden of proof being upon the person seeking admission to the United States. The Immigration Act of 1924 states that all persons ineligible for citizenship under our naturalization law shall be excluded from the United States.

So from every angle of approach, when we consider the Mexicans who came across the border without any permit to do so or those who came without complying with the literacy test and other requirements, or those who are ineligible on account of their Indian blood, it is certainly a conservative statement to say that there are 500,000 Mexicans who are illegally in the United States.

In my speech of May 20 I also stated that there were 500,000 aliens who entered the country illegally in the guise of seamen and who became lost in our population.

Since some of my figures have been challenged, I desire to be more specific in this connection. Under the *La Follette* Act an alien seaman has the right to land on our shore upon the arrival of his ship and to remain in our country for 90 days. We have had no accurate way to check up upon the number of desertions. We have had to rely upon the reports of the shipowners. However, it has been carefully estimated that not less than 500,000 aliens deserted their ships in the period of 10 years prior to 1930 and were lost in our population. The present Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. McCormack, stated in his annual report for the year ended June 30, 1933, as follows:

In the past oftentimes as many as half of the crew of vessels of certain flags, passed as bona fide seamen, would desert in port and when the vessel came to sail the master would sign on none or very few others to replace them, a plain indication that the crew was excessive upon arrival, and a moral certainty that aliens had been signed on for a consideration and with foreknowledge that illegal entry into the United States was planned. This is one of the many rackets to circumvent the immigration laws, but is not actionable unless convincing and corroborative evidence of conspiracy is obtained, which is almost impossible, as the deserters speedily lose themselves in our population.

The former Commissioner General of Immigration, in his annual report for 1931, states:

For the 21 years, from 1907 to 1927, a total of 271,197 alien seamen deserted at seaports, and this number, added to the recorded desertion since then, brings the figure to 307,320 in just 25 years, or an average of 12,292 per year.

Mr. Frank Morrison, the secretary of the American Federation of Labor, testified on February 24, 1931, before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in reference to alien seamen. He submitted evidence to show that at least 500,000 immigrants have unlawfully entered the United States disguised as seamen since 1921. This figure has been used by many authorities as accurate.

In the petition and memorials submitted to Congress by Andrew Furuseth, president of the American Seamen of America, it is stated that Chinese have paid from \$1,000 to \$1,100 for being landed in the United States, and excluded Europeans and South Americans have paid from \$200 to \$400.

He states that the reported desertions represent only those reported by foreign-ship masters to our immigration officers.

The real number is at least 50 percent more as it now stands. It is quite common to carry a much larger crew in coming to the United States than in going away. The difference in number of desertions reported to the consuls is very great. Comparison between the number given by the masters of vessels of 10 firms and the number furnished to consular officers in New York showed an increase in the consular offices of 40 percent, and that comparison was made in New York alone and in 10 firms only.

I do not have time now to deal with the aliens who illegally cross the Canadian border and lose themselves in our population. It is well known, however, that the number that have done this in the past 15 years is very great.

The Commissioner General of Immigration states in his annual report ending June 30, 1933, that the value of vehicles which were seized by the Government and which had been largely used to smuggle aliens into the United States was \$283,744. The Government seized 13 aircraft worth \$89,500. In the same report he says:

Illegal entries have not greatly decreased on the Mexican border.

The very fact that the Labor Department is advocating the passage of the Kerr bill, H. R. 8163, which, among other things, would legalize the entrance of all aliens who came between 1921 and 1924 and who cannot show a record of admission for permanent residence, is recognition of the fact that there are many aliens in this country who are unlawfully here. The act of June 3, 1921, legalized all entries to that date. This date was used because the temporary 3-percent quota act went into effect on that date. The reason for this act was expressed by Hon. Albert Johnson, who at that time was Chairman of the Immigration Committee:

The reason for extending what you term as charity prior to June 3, 1921, was that among the entries in the years before that date it was found that the Government had not kept complete records of entry, and certainly no records prior to 1906. It had been found also that among the old-time immigrants over the country were many who could not prove the date or find the name of the ship when they came up for naturalization. The Naturalization Bureau had to refer these applications to the Immigration Bureau so that the latter Bureau could search the records. Many clerks were kept busy at Federal expense, principally at Ellis Island, going over ship manifests of 25 years or more ago, in an effort to find the name of the man and the ship. It was decided to relieve such aliens up to the time we began to admit immigrants under restrictions by number.

In 1929 efforts were made to legalize all entrants prior to July 1, 1924. Mr. Hull, who was then the Commissioner of Immigration, favored the bill and made this significant statement:

This bill changes the date so that we could proceed with that legalizing up to July 1, 1924. After that date, of course, no one will propose any further extension of that time, and the reason of that is clear if you understand the law. After July 1, 1924, if an alien came in here without a legal entry we can deport him, but before that we cannot.

Of course, no one knows how many aliens entered the country illegally from July 1, 1921, to July 1, 1924, but it is safe to say that there is a considerable number of such aliens; otherwise, the pressure would not be so great to pass this law and legalize the illegal entrants. No one will contend that Congress does not have the power to deport these aliens if it sees fit. How many of these aliens were smuggled into the United States, no one knows. How many of them walked across the borders, no one knows.

In discussing the matter of legalizing these entrances, Hon. THOMAS JENKINS, one of the ablest and most consistent advocates of immigration in the Congress, stated:

The reason we allow all those who were in before 1921 to have the rights to first papers was because we had no quota law and we forgave them all their exigencies and let them have their first papers. After that time we always maintain that there was a law and any man who came in contrary to that law, after that time, came in violation of the law. If we now seek to pass this bill we are affording protection to those who violated the law, and will place in position for naturalization 5,000,000 people.

In the Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1932, we find the following significant statement:

The virtual shutting off of European immigration to Canada, as a protection to that country, has now decreased the number of European aliens who would make the Dominion a stepping stone or training center for smuggling into the United States, their real destination in the first place, but plenty now are continuing to try to get across the line. On the Mexican border there has been a great increase in the number of illegal entries.

The World Almanac gives a total foreign-born population, as of 1930, at 13,366,407, which includes white persons, 98,620 Negroes, 116,998 Mexicans, 44,086 Chinese, 70,477 Japanese. According to the World Almanac, arrivals here from 1920 to April 1, 1930, account for 35.5 percent of the Negro immigrants, 39.6 percent of the Mexican, 21.9 percent of the Indian, 36.2 percent of the Chinese, and 20.1 percent of the Japanese. The Negroes have come in a large part from Cuba, Jamaica, Haiti, Santo Domingo, and the other islands of the West Indies. Of this total number of foreign-born population, according to the World Almanac, 7,859,193 were naturalized, according to the 1930 census, and only 1,246,521 had first papers. This left approximately 5,505,214 aliens who had not been naturalized. Since 1930 approximately 392,293 aliens were admitted to citizenship in 1931, 1932, and 1933. I do not have the exact figures for this. The World Almanac says that only 1,246,521 aliens had their first papers in 1930. I do not have the number of aliens who have first papers as of this date. But, according to the 1930 census, nearly 4,000,000 aliens had not taken out their first papers. There was certainly a reason for this. Of course, some of these aliens may not care to become American citizens, but there is every reason why the great majority of them should want their citizenship papers. Many States are passing laws excluding aliens from public works and from old-age pensions, and for economic reasons there is the greatest incentive for the alien to become an American citizen if he can do so.

In my judgment, a large part of these aliens are unlawfully in the country and are ineligible to citizenship.

I am wondering if the fact that many of these aliens are unlawfully in the country and subject to deportation is responsible for the provisions in the Kerr bill which would authorize an interdepartmental committee to permit certain classes of aliens under certain circumstances to remain in the United States even though they are mandatorily deportable under existing law, and that provision of the bill which would legalize illegal entrants.

I have shown that there are approximately 5,000,000 aliens in the United States according to the census records. But this does not by any means include all aliens who are unlawfully here. Many aliens who were smuggled into the United States or who crossed the borders illegally or came in in violation to our laws would naturally avoid the census enumerators. Knowing that they are subject to deportation, they would not give any information to the census enumerators. But even according to the information disclosed by the census, there are about 5,000,000 aliens who are not naturalized and 4,000,000 of such aliens who have never taken out their first papers. The very fact that these 4,000,000 aliens have not taken out their first papers and the fact that there is such tremendous pressure to legalize illegal entrants and to permit certain classes of deportable aliens under certain circumstances to remain in the United States should be sufficient evidence to any thinking person that a large part of the known aliens in the United States are here illegally.

If, therefore, we take the 5,000,000 known aliens in the United States and add to them 2,500,000 aliens who avoided the census enumerators, we have 7,500,000 in this country. Based upon careful study, I have reached the conclusion that there are perhaps 3,500,000 aliens illegally in the United States. There may be considerably more. If anyone disputes these figures and conclusions there is one way that we can settle this matter for all times. We can pass a law requiring every alien in the United States to be registered and be fingerprinted and appropriate sufficient money to see that this is done. We can require every alien to prove within 1 year from date that he is in the country legally and show

that he is eligible for citizenship. All aliens who cannot comply with this requirement can be permitted to voluntarily depart the country or be deported. We can make allowances for meritorious cases that should be shown clemency and still be able to get rid of aliens who are unfit for citizenship and have no business in this country.

It must not be forgotten that most figures used in regard to the admission of aliens and departure of aliens are taken from the records of the Immigration Bureau. The Bureau, however, does not have any record of the number of aliens who illegally entered. Much is said about the figures of the Immigration Bureau showing that about 67,619 more aliens departed in 1932 than were admitted and that about 56,913 more aliens departed than were admitted in 1933, and that about 17,000 more aliens departed in 1934 than were admitted. This does not take into account the illegal entrants and is more than offset by the fact that in 1930 about 190,000 more aliens were admitted than departed, and that in 1931 about 36,000 more aliens were admitted than departed. This does not take into account the temporary conditions resulting from the depression. Neither does it take into consideration the fact that there are about 900,000 aliens ready to enter the United States as soon as the temporary administrative restrictions are removed.

So that if we take into consideration the number of aliens who are illegally in the country and whose presence is not disclosed by the census or by the records of the Immigration Bureau, it is certainly a conservative statement to say that there are 16,500,000 foreign born in this country today and 7,500,000 aliens who have not been naturalized and probably 6,000,000 who have not made any attempt to become American citizens.

Later on I shall submit additional evidence to prove my contention that there are at least 3,500,000 aliens illegally in the United States.

It is equally difficult to accurately state how many aliens in this country are on public relief. The Relief Administration made a rough estimate that there were approximately 600,000. This figure does not check with other information that I have received. From all the information that I have been able to obtain from public and private sources there are from 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 aliens directly and indirectly on public relief. If, however, this figure is challenged, I suggest that the Relief Administration immediately take an accurate and dependable census of all aliens on public relief.

Mr. Speaker, my investigation of the number of aliens in the United States and those illegally here is by no means completed. I am making a comprehensive survey of the entire situation. I have requested a number of citizens in various parts of the country to furnish me with information in regard to the aliens in their particular localities. I am seeking information from various public officials who are in position to know about this. I have requested the Bureau of Immigration to furnish me with their interpretation of the statistics. What I am chiefly concerned with is to get the facts regardless of what they show. From time to time, as I collect this information, I shall give Congress the benefit of it, because in my judgment this is one of the most important questions that confronts the American people. Its proper solution will mean much to the future happiness and well-being of this Republic. I am not actuated by racial or religious prejudice but I do believe that charity should begin at home and that self-preservation is the first law of nature.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by the Honorable Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, delivered at the University of Alabama commencement exercises on Monday, May 27, 1935.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, at University of Alabama commencement exercises, University, Ala., May 27, 1935:

I would speak to you tonight of academic freedom—freedom to trall the truth into its most secret hiding place; freedom to proclaim the truth when found and verified; freedom to live one's life with the window of the soul open to new thoughts, new ideas, and new aspirations.

It may seem strange that with the twentieth century more than one-third gone it should be necessary to make a plea for the recognition and preservation of those precious civil liberties to enjoy which our forefathers, enduring every privation and braving every peril, sought these shores; to establish which as part of the fundamental law of the land, they fought the War of the Revolution. Yet it is not strange after all. If you have read your history, you know that from the beginning of time it has been a never-ending struggle, not only to acquire freedom, but to hold onto that most worth while of all possessions even after it has been won at great cost.

There always has been, and probably there always will be, a small group of men, lustful for power and ruthless in the means they adopt to acquire it, who would tear up Magna Carta, our own Bill of Rights, and every other charter of liberty that has ever been written by the hand of man, in order to aggrandize themselves at the expense of those least able to protect themselves. Constant pressure to this end always exists. Over long periods it may be so subtle as almost to be imperceptible, but at times of social and economic unrest, such as the present when, anxiously and soberly, we are trying to work our way back to solid ground, an open assault is all too likely to be made to capture the citadel of our liberties.

The beginning of such an effort is apparent today. As yet it is more or less tentative. It does not yet possess the vigor or the proportions that it can acquire. But if we fail to understand certain significant political trends of the moment or if, understanding them, we are too slothful or too indifferent to defend the priceless heritage that our forefathers have bequeathed to us, then, indeed, there is little hope that our once free America will not in her turn meekly submit to the manacles that already have been riveted upon the wrists of many of the countries of the world that until recent years were composed of free peoples.

The Bill of Rights guarantees to every American citizen the right of free press, free speech, and free assemblage. These rights are of equal importance. The man who insists on the right freely to give voice to his own opinions and who at the same time would deny the same right to a newspaper because he does not agree with the views of that newspaper is no true American. By the same token, the newspaper that will not tolerate the abridgment of its right freely to print the news and to comment thereon while at the same time spurring on those who would suppress the equally valid rights of free speech and free assemblage is slowly but surely undermining the very foundations upon which it is built. It is inconceivable that the right of a free press can long survive if the rights of free speech and free assemblage have been seriously abridged or altogether denied.

Certain people today are not only encouraging, but apparently leading what appears to be a deliberate and concerted onslaught on academic freedom, which is of the very essence of free speech. In the final analysis, our colleges and universities are the citadels, not only of our liberties, but of civilization itself. During the Dark Ages when men hermetically sealed the doors of their minds against new ideas, the only faint gleam of the light that was life was kept burning in those cloistered retreats where the scholar bent over his illuminated vellum in his intent search for the truth that comes only from knowledge. Thanks to him, the faint flicker that became a flaming torch during the days of the Renaissance has grown, in these modern times, into a giant beacon of glorious incandescence whose beneficent light is shed over all the world. It is inconceivable that any group of men should undertake ever to dim that light. It is even more strange that, in order to assist sinister influences in their attempt to discredit the universities, some of the graduates of our colleges and universities should sell to the highest bidder in the market place the brains that would be of little account if they had not been developed by some institution of higher learning.

Looking back over the last 2 years, we can now trace certain significant events. In the beginning, this administration was derided and jeered at because, in its efforts to meet wisely the social and economic crisis that it had inherited from its predecessors, it called to its aid men of trained intelligences. It seemed outrageous to certain people that a highly paid lobbyist or the representative of selfish interests should be relegated to the rear and, instead, a college professor consulted on a subject on which he had special knowledge. That was revolutionary; our Government had not recently been run on the bizarre theory that disinterested and trained intelligences should be called into the public service instead of practical men who knew exactly what they wanted and how to go about getting it.

So in all parts of the country, but with particular enthusiasm in circles of entrenched privilege, hymns of hateful ridicule were sung in derision of the so-called "brain trust." From this initial attack upon particular professors it was natural that criticism should widen and become more general. Soon it began to be hinted that something was wrong with the colleges themselves. Not only did they produce ridiculous professors, specialists capable of giving advice in political science, political economy, and cognate subjects, but the interests of the students were permitted to range too widely. It came to be charged that our colleges were not conservative in their teachings. In due course it was discovered that some of them had radical leanings. The next step was to allege that the colleges generally were hotbeds of radical-

ism, following which came accusation that communism is actually being taught in certain of our institutions of higher learning.

The charge is as ridiculous as it is unfounded. But those who would destroy academic freedom needed some excuse for their onslaught on the colleges and they are not notorious for their scrupulous adherence to the truth.

Now, I call your attention to one significant fact and that is that not a single newspaper in the country has ever made the charge that fascism is being taught in any of our institutions of higher learning. If any has it has escaped my notice. One or two liberal magazines have been concerned about the attempt that they fear fascism has been making to gain a foothold in one of our universities but this charge has never been made, to my knowledge, by those who support the absurd accusation that our colleges are teaching communism. The explanation of this curious circumstance is not far to seek. There are selfish men in this country who, in their hearts, would like to see the United States swing to fascism. They believe that under such a system they and their kind could secure control of the Government. They would be able then, in the name of patriotism, to destroy our liberties and build on the ruins of our beloved free America an economic state, the concern of which, with the exploiting class once firmly in control, would be to see to it that the rich would even grow richer, whatever might happen to the poor.

The true American will not tolerate a dictatorship either of the right or of the left. Fascism and communism are equally abhorrent to us. Both are tyrannies. Both should be resisted with all our strength.

Point out to me the man who glorifies the Fascist system and who insists that the times require the firm hand of a ruler clothed with dictatorial power and I will show you the man who either has become rich and powerful as a result of the enjoyment of special privileges or who wants to become rich and powerful by whatever ruthless means may be available to him. Or show me the agitator who would tear up our Constitution and create a communist state and I will show you a man who, equally with the Fascist, has no respect for the rights of the individual; who would destroy for the sake of destroying; who would take what another man possesses, not under the forms of law, not as the result of the legitimate exercise of constitutional powers, but merely because he desires to take and is able to take.

Fascism would be as destructive of our rights and liberties as would communism, and it is my deliberate judgment that if we should foolishly adhere to fascism, because it seemed to point a way out of our present economic difficulties, or because it appeared to offer the surest bulwark against communism, we would find that after the dictatorship of the right would have run its course, we would swing over to the other extreme into a dictatorship of the left. Fascism would be only a brief interlude on the road to communism.

The preservation of academic freedom, the maintenance of the civil liberties guaranteed in the Constitution, out of which the right of academic freedom grows, is of extraordinary importance to this Nation at this time. The truly educated, and by that I mean those who have trained minds that they use, must gravely heed the signs of danger that are implicit in the attacks on academic freedom that have become more and more threatening during recent months. The sinister purposes of those who would establish a Fascist state on our free American soil are clear from the very nature of this bold assault upon our institutions of higher learning.

If it is to be supposed that the present attack on freedom of thought and of research in our universities is not merely a whimsical and momentary thing, but has some purpose behind it, then the inference is inescapable that it represents an attempt to force upon America either a dictatorship of the right or of the left. A free America, serenely and confidently pursuing the course charted for it by our forefathers, has no interest in impinging upon academic freedom; the contrary, rather, because we know what a priceless contribution our institutions of higher learning have made to our civilization. That controlled and regimented schools of all grades are necessary to both the Fascist and the Communist state is well known to whomsoever is sufficiently interested to look into the matter. However, the present onslaught on our colleges comes from sources which completely negative any idea of a desire to establish a Communist state. Therefore, the weight of the evidence is that it is the Fascist element in America that would muzzle our professors and put wax in the ears of their students as a preliminary step in the direction of the establishment of a dictatorship in this country of, by, and for beneficiaries of special privilege.

Academic freedom could not long survive under either fascism or communism. If you would have proof of this statement, consider the situation today anywhere that universities are permitted to teach only what the government permits them to teach. Turn to the universities elsewhere which were formerly among the greatest in the world—universities to which some of our own outstanding scholars have gone for special training after winning the highest scholastic honors in their own country. Ruthlessly deprived of their right to search for the truth and to proclaim it for the benefit of mankind, they are now mere bondslaves to the political philosophy and economic theories of whatever faction may be in power.

The near future may tell how much of the stuff of real Americanism still remains in this country. After all, those who would destroy our liberties and seize power—not to improve our social order for the benefit of all the people but merely as a means of adding to their own wealth and position—are but a mere handful

out of the millions of our population. But although they are a very small minority, they constitute no mean foe. By far the greater part of the wealth of the Nation is within their control. Their alliances and ramifications reach everywhere. They are entrenched where one would least expect to find them. They have the advantage of knowing precisely what they want and the single-minded purpose to achieve their ends regardless of the cost to others.

But despite the power of these men, their preparedness and their ruthlessness, they cannot prevail unless we have become so indifferent to the fundamental liberties upon which our American civilization rests that we do not consider them worth fighting for. This I, for one, refuse to believe, once the issue becomes clear to the people. Especially am I confident that when the faculties, the graduates, and the students of our colleges and universities are made aware of the implications in the subtle attack that is now being made upon academic freedom, the curtailment or loss of which would destroy any incentive on the part of a free man to go to college, they will swarm to the defense of their fundamental rights in the same spirit in which their forefathers have rallied on every occasion when an attempt has been made to deprive them of that degree of freedom that they had already acquired.

The nature of the attack on academic freedom is such that we must be especially on our guard. We must not permit ourselves to be frightened into acceptance of a Fascist dictatorship by stimulated clamor against an imaginary communistic threat. As I have suggested, either system would be a noxious and dreadful growth if permitted to take even shallow root in the soil of our free country. The prospect of a dictatorship, either of the privileged class or of the proletariat, is too dreadful to contemplate. We want this country to continue to be one of free institutions, a land of equal opportunity under the law for every citizen, whether he be rich or poor and whatever may be his race, or color, or creed.

Almost 50 years ago a man who was twice honored by being elected President of the United States made a statement which is worth repeating in these times. This man was Grover Cleveland, and no one, by the widest stretch of the imagination, ever considered him either a radical or a dangerous citizen. He was talking about communism, and this is what he said:

"When to the selfishness of the beneficiaries of unjust discrimination under our laws there shall be added the discontent of those who suffer from such discrimination, we will realize the fact that the beneficent purposes of our Government, dependent upon the patriotism and contentment of our people, are endangered."

"Communism is a hateful thing and a menace to peace and organized government but the communism of combined wealth and capital, the outgrowth of overweening cupidity and selfishness, which insidiously undermines the justice and integrity of free institutions, is not less dangerous than the communism of oppressed poverty and toil, which, exasperated by injustice and discontent, attacks with wild disorder the citadel of rule."

"He mocks the people who proposes that the government shall protect the rich and that they in turn will care for the laboring poor."

"Any intermediary between the people and their government or the least delegation of the care and protection the Government owes to the humblest citizen in the land makes the boast of free institutions a glittering delusion and the pretended boon of American citizenship a shameless imposition."

There was no such term as "fascism" at the time Cleveland made this penetrating statement, but that fascism existed and that Cleveland recognized it for what it was is shown by his phrase "communism of combined wealth and capital." Today we know communism of combined wealth and capital as fascism, and we know it, just as Cleveland knew it, as being an equal, if not a greater, threat to our liberties than the "communism of oppressed poverty and toil." I suspect that if Grover Cleveland, clear-thinking and forthright American that he was, were here today and should again denounce in his vigorous fashion the overweening cupidity and selfishness of combined wealth and capital he would find himself under suspicion of being a dangerous citizen. And if, perchance, as a member of a college faculty, he should make any such subversive statement as I have quoted, he would in all likelihood become the subject of an investigation by a legislative committee.

Some 3 months ago one of the truly great men of the Anglo-Saxon race died in Washington. It is especially inspiring at a time when we are once more going into battle to maintain our liberties to be able to drink at the pure stream of the philosophic Americanism of Mr. Justice Holmes. No one knew better than he what the Constitution meant. No one ever had greater zeal than was his to follow the light of liberty that has beckoned through all the ages since man first realized that he was free and Godlike in that degree to which he permitted the rays of truth to enter the window of his soul.

Who would not wish that he might have the ability and the courage to speak out with the clarity of this great American on the subject of our constitutional rights? Well might we make these ringing and profound words of Mr. Justice Holmes our American credo:

"* * * If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate * * *"

And what greater justification of full and unimpaired academic freedom for every university in the land could be urged than in

these words of this man who was aptly described by Prof. Felix Frankfurter as our "most civilized American":

" . . . when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year, if not every day, we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system, I think we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expressions of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death . . ."

I have just quoted Justice Holmes as saying that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market. This view is at distinct variance with the theory of those who would abridge academic freedom, who insist that there must be no competition, no interchange of ideas, no testing of obnoxious political theories in the laboratory of truth. Such a position is no compliment to our form of government. It has always seemed to me that the American system stands out in clear and favorable relief in comparison with other systems. But a comparison must be made in order to afford one a clear appreciation of the superiority of our institutions over those of many less-favored countries. He is a timid American indeed and a shabby patriot who is so little sure of the American form of government that he avoids measuring it with others.

When I was in college I recall that a course was offered in comparative religions by the brilliant first president of the University of Chicago, the late William Rainey Harper. No one objected to the college student learning about Hinduism, Shintoism, Mohammedanism, ancestor worship, or even voodooism. There were no demands made for legislative investigations, no trials for heresy, no faintest suggestion on the part even of ministers of the church that the university cease and desist from a study of alien religions because such a study might undermine Christianity.

The historian in lecturing to his classes tells of kings and emperors and of oligarchies with never a thought that he may be engendering in the minds of his students a desire to supplant the President of the United States with an absolute and hereditary monarch. In your anthropology classes you learn that at other times, or even presently in other places, there exist social systems based upon polygyny or polyandry, and such studies are not interdicted because some busybody is fearful lest you may advocate such a social system for the United States of America. And it is taken for granted that scientists may study noxious poisons and virulent diseases without laying themselves open to the suspicion that they harbor some diabolical design upon the welfare of their fellow citizens.

But those members of our college faculties who are charged with the responsibility of educating their students in the highly important subject of political science are not to be allowed, if certain meddling and censorious persons have their say, even to mention the subject of communism in their classes. According to this theory universities are expected to send their graduates out into the world to resist communism without knowing what it is or where it is. In many States the Communist Party is entitled to a place on the ballot. If ignorance is, indeed, bliss, then there is danger that if the graduates of our colleges are to be kept in the dark as to what communism is, they might vote that ticket by mistake. To quote briefly from a statement by Congressman HAMILTON FISH, which was published on May 10 last: ". . . We have a right and a duty to find out the facts as to how it (communism) works in Russia and expose its tragic and horrible failure."

Ignorance has never yet proved to be either virtue or strength of character. If communism is the menace that we believe it is, then, instead of keeping the students in our educational institutions in abysmal darkness on the subject, we ought to prepare their intelligence to grapple with it by the fullest possible exposition of its defects and fallacies. It is to be regretted if we feel so little sure of the firmness of the foundations upon which this America of ours rests that we are fearful that they will be undermined by false theories, especially if the error that threatens them has been thoroughly exposed. If we are in peril from the enemy either within or without our gates, then in all good conscience let us learn what manner of enemy it is, what is the nature of its attack, and what is the best means of meeting that attack.

I am in full agreement with what Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, a partner in the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., recently said. Here are his words: "These are days when among the teaching forces . . . the freest sort of academic freedom should prevail."

For my part, looking ahead, I am content as I reflect that the witch hunters in times past have burned thousands of books that their feeble intellects could not comprehend. They have racked the bodies of philosophers and burned scientists at the stake, but the truth they sought to crush has always arisen again all the stronger by reason of its attempted crucifixion.

There is a fine old aphorism, "Seek the truth and the truth shall make you free." Considering the times, I would express this in this wise: "Hold onto the truth and the truth will keep you free." The university that can send its graduates into the world inspired with this belief as a fighting faith will of a verity be sending out educated men and women and, more important still, free Americans, who will never permit the precious heritage of freedom which is theirs to be impaired.

HOW CAN WE HELP THE MORTGAGED FARMERS?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the effect of the legislation on farm mortgages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the defeat of the Frazier-Lemke farm-mortgage moratorium in the Supreme Court of the United States has once more brought the Nation's attention to the situation confronting the mortgaged farmer. Today the farmers of America owe more money than they can ever pay, no matter what process tax, what price, or how much of a crop they may produce. Nothing can bring solvency except a cancellation of the debt, or at least that part of it which the farmer cannot pay and which threatens his home and the lives of his family.

The Frazier-Lemke bill provided at least some relief, and unless the mortgagee was willing to take all the property was worth, then the Court might extend a 5-year period to the farmer during which he could remain on his farm, paying a reasonable amount for the use of the property. The hope was that during the 5-year period conditions might change so that the farmer could redeem his property. The supporters of this bill never dreamed that when a farmer was willing to pay all his property was worth, that the Supreme Court would say that it was taking property from the mortgagee without due process of law. The Supreme Court is of the opinion that the National Bankruptcy Act, which the Frazier-Lemke bill sought to amend, was enacted in the first place for the benefit of the creditor and not the debtor.

Under the interpretation of the Supreme Court a farmer must pay even if his property is of insufficient value with which to pay. There is no escape for the farmer. What will be the result of this decision? It means that foreclosures will start up with considerable enthusiasm on the part of the Shylock mortgage holders. Under the Constitution they have that right, and the farmers will be foreclosed upon and evicted. Whole families will be driven from their homes and sent to the relief rolls for their daily bread. The farm home will be destroyed and the farm family scattered to the four winds. All because the creditor cannot be denied his pound of flesh, all because we cannot reduce the unpayable debt without violating the Constitution with respect to due process of law.

Those who make an argument against the seriousness of the farmer's condition financially are dishonest in their statements. They say that the farmer is in better condition now than he was in 1929. They seek to prove this statement by showing that the farm indebtedness in 1929 was approximately \$9,000,000,000, but that today the farm indebtedness is only \$8,000,000,000. That statement proves nothing. If the farmers of America still had the farms they had in 1929, a just comparison could be made. The glaring fact is that since 1929 a large percentage of the farms have been taken under foreclosure, and once taken, the debt no longer shows up in the farmer's debt column. The debts were reduced as the foreclosures increased. Speaking for my own State alone—North Dakota—I can advise this House that since the year 1920, 62 percent of all farm homes in North Dakota have been foreclosed, and very few redemptions have been made. The owner has been forced to change his position; in fact, in many cases his position has changed twice since 1920. From owner he found himself to be a renter, and, finally, from renter he has sunk lower in the scale and has finally landed on the permanent relief rolls.

If we, as farmers, still had the same property upon which we owed \$9,000,000,000 in 1926, we would owe today approximately \$14,000,000,000. From this huge debt, using this comparison, there is no relief under any Government finance plan now upon the statute books. The only agency in existence is the Federal land bank system, and that cannot relieve, because the old debt is very much more than any commitment that can be obtained from the Federal land bank. In North Dakota alone, with a farm indebtedness of \$300,000,000, the Federal land bank has not refinanced more

than 27 percent of the debt, and that leaves 73 percent of the farms in jeopardy. I think it perfectly fair to state that this condition which prevails in North Dakota is similar to the conditions which prevail in 16 of the best agricultural States in America.

What can the farmers do to save their homes in view of this smashing blow dealt them by the Supreme Court? That will depend upon what States farmers live in. In North Dakota, under the proclamation of the Governor, foreclosures have been, during the past 3 years, practically unknown. As the emergency increases the proclamations will no doubt be further extended. Should a farmer live in New Mexico he will have to move from his farm and look up the nearest relief office. Recently in that State the courts and the Governor permitted a holding company of the First National Bank of St. Paul to foreclose a contract and oust a colony from the possession of their premises where there was less than \$2,000 due on a contract and where the value of the farm property to the extent of \$143,000 was swept away. To make the devastation more complete, the court permitted the holding company to attach all the personal property and even the food of the colony. The 48 members of the colony have now lost all their property, both real and personal, and will be compelled to remain on permanent relief with their families until some new work opens for them.

Many States, fortunately, have moratorium laws, and that will be the only salvation for the people. Even that cannot be continued indefinitely. More substantial legislation must be passed by Congress. In my judgment, the following measures before Congress should be immediately passed:

First. A national moratorium—Burdick resolution, House Joint Resolution 83—which provides a period of 2 years in which the loans financed directly and indirectly by the Government will not be foreclosed. The need for this action is apparent now in the increased activity in some States of the Federal land bank and the Crop Production Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration in foreclosing on loans.

Second. The immediate passage of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill, which will make it possible for farmers to refinance their loans and thus spread the debt over a long period of time, at low interest rates, which will insure the preservation of the farm home until our conditions become again normal. Many organizations oppose this bill because they say it means inflation to issue Treasury notes instead of bonds. Nothing could be further from the truth. Both bond issues and currency issues if carried beyond a sound currency base, either metals or commodities, would be inflation. In this country we can issue at least \$8,000,000,000 more in currency before we ever reach a point where the present currency base, gold and silver, is not a sufficient protection against inflation.

The only real difference in the two methods is that in the issue of Treasury notes in the amount of \$3,000,000,000 as a revolving fund for the refinancing of the farm mortgages it will cost nothing in interest. While a bond issue would cost the American people 3½-percent interest on the full amount needed to refinance the farm mortgages.

The day is not far distant when we shall have come to the end of the road in issuing bonds and paying interest on them, when we could, with perfect safety, make a clear saving of this interest. Some day we will look back in our history and understand how miserably we have failed to understand that the payment annually of an interest toll of a billion and a quarter dollars on the public debt was as unnecessary as it was insane. Some day the American people will wrest from the hands of private interest the authority to use the Government's cash and credit for their own private profit. Some day the general good of all will transcend the right of private interest to reap a reward while the millions suffer.

Third. The passage of the Massingale cost-of-production bill. While the farmer is struggling under this unbearable load of debt, created because we have turned our Government finances over to private interests, the least this Congress can

do for the farm millions is to say, "Loyal friends of this Government, from this time forward the people of the United States do not wish to have you toil in the fields for our food and clothing, and then compel you to sell those products to us for less than the cost of production, including in such cost, a living wage for the toilers." I think it fair to say that, naturally, there are but few people in this country who will deny the farmers this natural right. On that part of the crops as are consumed in this country the farmer should have the cost of production; if he raises more, do not prevent him from raising it, but say to him, "We cannot guarantee you cost of production on this surplus—you should keep this surplus until a time comes when you underproduce."

This temporary surplus will find its way to necessary human use, and the safety of the country is more secure with too much food on hand than not enough. In the history of mankind there have never been surpluses. The human race does not produce more than the human race needs. Temporary surplus which looks like mountains in some short periods vanish the next instant. From the days of 6,000 years before Christ to the present moment, I ask the Members of this House to tell me where all these surpluses are. I repeat to you now what I have said before, that the destruction of food and clothing or the deliberate refusal to produce food and clothing, when God sends the rain and the sunshine is a crime against humanity.

Why will Congress not report these bills out under a rule that will permit open discussion on the merits of the bills? Why will Members refuse to sign petitions to bring in a rule under which these bills can be freely discussed? To arbitrarily prevent this consideration is too un-American for this great body to entertain. I trust every Member who has not signed the petition to bring in a rule under which the Frazier-Lemke bill can be discussed, will sign petition no. 7, and do it now. I trust Members will support the resolution for a national moratorium and the Massingale cost-of-production bill. These are the ways, the only ways, provided in pending legislation, which can now bring relief to 30,000,000 people who live in farm homes and to 30,000,000 who are directly identified in crop production in this country.

During the months of January, February, and March, in speeches in this Chamber, I tried to impress the Congress with the necessity for speedy action in seed and feed for the farmers in the drought area. I was then apprehensive that aid would come too late and that fear has now proven real. Thousands of farmers lost their livestock because of insufficient feed, thousands now are unable to secure sufficient seed, some none at all. Rains have come and the drought is definitely broken, and in spite of this our delay in our action is responsible for the situation where farmers now have no seed.

Let us not make any further mistakes. Let us not delay action on these relief bills for the mortgaged farmer until they are so desperately backed to the wall that they will revolt in mass against all foreclosures and cause themselves and the Government itself unnecessary trouble. That they will, when finally confronted with ouster from their homes of half a century, fight for the possession of that home, no one will question. I believe I am as close to mental attitude of the farmers as anyone in this House, and I know they will not meekly submit to being driven from their homes, due to no fault of their own. This Congress should not push the unfortunate farmers too far, and all serious difficulty can be avoided if we will immediately pass legislation that will give them a chance to save their homes.

The situation calls for prompt and nonpolitical action in the interest of those people who form the backbone of this Nation. We owe it to them to strip all procedure of redtape and get down to business. If we are not permitted to provide them with a law to scale down debts that never can be paid, we can offer them another avenue of escape through the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill, the Massingale cost-of-production bill, and a national moratorium.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein certain statements and an essay by a young fellow from my district who won in a contest on What I Would Do if I Were President. It is very brief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. I object.

AN ACT TO LIQUIDATE FARM MORTGAGES AND PROVIDE HOMESTEADS FREE OF DEBT FOR ACTUAL FARM FAMILIES

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short table that I prepared myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House today a measure which proposes to liquidate the farm debts of this Nation, reestablish the farm families in their homes, free of debt, restore their purchasing power, and protect them in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor.

In our country today over two-thirds of the farmers are either tenants or have their farms heavily mortgaged, and this percentage is steadily growing each year.

I live in the country and I know it is not right for the millions of boys and girls who are born in the rural sections to be forced to live in poverty and serfdom, with no hope of ever owning a home, free of debt.

The farm lands of this Nation are fertile. They provide ample means for the support of any industrious family.

An unfair and unjust economic system has forced our people from their homes. It has deprived us of the fruits of our labor; and it has robbed us of our freedom and our happiness.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD COME TO FARMER'S AID

Our Federal Government can and should remedy this deplorable condition. It can lift the mortgages from our lands and give back to deserving farm families their homes. It can protect the mothers and fathers as they earnestly strive to properly rear their families and make them secure in their homes by preventing these homes from again being sold or mortgaged; and it can give to the boys and girls who are reared in the country an opportunity to develop their lives in freedom and independence.

In an effort to regain for my people their homes and these rights I have prepared this measure which is known as "An act to liquidate farm mortgages and provide homes, free of debt, for actual farm families."

ACT CREATES NO NEW BOARD

This act does not set up any new board or Government agency. Neither does it provide for any additional public officials.

The law is to be administered through the General Land Office, which is one of the oldest departments of our Federal Government, and which is now ready to put it into force just as soon as it is adopted.

LAND PROGRAM WILL COST ONE-HALF AMOUNT WE HAVE GIVEN EUROPE

The entire cost of this great land-redemption program will equal about one-half the amount of money that our Nation has donated to the people of Europe since 1914, or about \$10,000,000,000.

Our contribution to the people of Europe has only won their hatred.

The contribution which we will make to the people of our country by carrying out the provisions of this measure will cause millions of good men, women, and children throughout our great Nation to "arise up and call her blessed."

This Government will lift from the backs of the farmers and producers of new wealth the curse of an ever-mounting debt that is crushing their happiness and freedom, and will promote and encourage private initiative—checking the ever-increasing tendency toward governmental regulation of and interference with the private affairs of our people.

It will make us again a Nation of home owners.

This measure provides that the General Land Office purchase farm mortgages; liquidate farm debts; and give small farm homesteads, free of debt, back to deserving farm families. Through its provisions the entire farm-mortgage debt, which is now approximately \$9,000,000,000, may be

liquidated. However, these provisions are optional, permitting each individual an opportunity to take advantage of them, but forcing none to do so.

It in no way affects the ownership of private lands free of debt. Neither does it in any manner prohibit or interfere with such ownership.

It does not set up one group of farmers in competition with another or grant special privileges or rights to any group.

It does, however, give exactly the same opportunities to every farm family of this Nation.

RENTS AND MORTGAGE DEBTS PREVENT RETURN OF PROSPERITY

The basic reason for the present depression continuing to exist is the fact that the producers of the raw products—our farmers—cannot now exchange the full value of their new wealth for the finished products. They are denied this right.

Since it is the farmer who produces the new wealth, certainly it is to the farmer that the finished product must be sold or exchanged.

When the farmer enjoys the full use of his raw products, produced by him and his family by applying their energies to the soil, there is no reason why, under normal conditions, he cannot and will not exchange them for the full output of finished products.

However, at present the farmer does not enjoy the full use of his new wealth. A large portion of it is lost in rents, interest, and royalties, for which he receives nothing in exchange.

Rents, interest, and royalties contribute nothing toward producing this new wealth. Therefore such portion of it as is used in this manner completely loses its exchange value insofar as the producer is concerned.

The farmer is forced to throw on the market that portion of his new wealth which is used in this manner, but he and his family are unable to buy it back in the finished product. It therefore becomes the surplus.

This surplus has continued to grow each year—as rents, interest, and royalties have continued to consume larger portions of the farmer's new wealth.

The natural result has been that the farmer has grown poorer while the surplus of raw products and finished products has steadily increased, until during the last few years we have witnessed a nation of people starving in the midst of plenty.

A normal and natural adjustment of this condition can never be attained until the full exchange value of the farmer's raw products, or new wealth, is restored to him.

The measure which I have presented is designed to accomplish this result.

It gives the farmer free access to the soil, eliminates rents, interest and royalties, and fully restores the purchasing power of the farmer's new wealth.

The inevitable result of this procedure will be a return to normal prosperity.

THE LAND LAWS OF MOSES EMBODIED IN BILL

This measure includes a simple land redemption program, and carries out the command of our Divine Creator as set forth in the law of Moses in directing that, "in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land."

In this same law of Moses the people are warned against selling their farms—"The land shall not be sold forever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me."

This law, in conformity with these commands, places the farmer again in the possession of his home and his farm. It also prevents this farm from again being mortgaged or sold forever.

It thus protects the hard-working farmer and his family who are earning an honest living by the sweat of their brow from the selfish schemes of designing money lenders. It protects them in their right to use in exchange the full value of the products of their labor.

The principles of this law are as fundamental and as sound as the other fundamental principles upon which this Government is built.

They are simple and practical. And they are essential to the continued existence of our free institutions.

FARM HOMES, FREE OF DEBT, ESSENTIAL TO LIFE OF OUR GOVERNMENT

Our people are dependent upon agriculture for life and existence; and our freedom, which we so greatly cherish, cannot possibly survive when those of our people who are engaged in agriculture and in the production of the raw products or new wealth do not have free access to the soil and are not protected in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor.

Our Government is especially designed so as to provide for each citizen equally the greatest possible safety, liberty, and independence.

Our Federal Constitution sets forth specifically the rights of each citizen.

It further protects from oppression those who become indebted to other citizens by providing for national bankrupt laws.

However, the founders of this Government did not visualize the time when the entire area of this country would become settled. They did not foresee the day when a citizen who has lost all his worldly possessions would have no new land to which he could move with his family and begin life anew, continuing to enjoy his unalienable rights. Therefore, they made no provisions and no safeguards for such people under such conditions.

The time has arrived when such provisions and safeguards must be made if our people are to continue to enjoy their freedom and if our principles of free government are to be maintained.

At the time our Government was established, other than Negro slavery, there was no tenant system in this country. Such tenantry as existed was of a voluntary nature and could be terminated at the will of the tenant.

This condition wherein the producers of the raw products or new wealth had free access to the soil and unrestricted use of their new wealth was an essential factor in the building of our Government.

This same condition, which has ceased to exist, is still essential to the life of our Government. And the bill which I have introduced in the House of Representatives is designed to reestablish such condition in this Nation.

One hundred years ago when a man's business affairs became so involved that he was burdened with a great debt he could seek refuge through the bankruptcy courts, liquidate his debts, and free himself of the burden. He could then move his family into new lands where he could acquire a home, rear his family in freedom and independence, and enjoy the fruits of his labor.

Today the free lands are gone.

When a man's business affairs now become so involved that he is burdened with a great debt he can still seek refuge through the bankruptcy courts, liquidate his debts, and free himself of these particular burdens.

However, there is no longer an avenue of escape from tenantry. There is no place in this country where he can go with his family, establish a home in freedom and independence, and enjoy the fruits of his labor.

The result of this condition is that the free home owner in this Nation is rapidly vanishing.

THE METABOLISM OF THE FARMER: HOME OWNER, MORTGAGOR, TENANT

We are degenerating into a Nation of tenants and serfs, and no nation can long survive as a free people when the vast majority of its farmers are tenants.

The number of farmers who own their homes free of debt grows less each year.

The number of tenant farmers who have no equity whatever in the land they tend becomes greater each year.

There is a middle class.

It is the group of farmers who own their homes but have a mortgage on them. This group in many respects is in worse condition than the tenant farmer. They must not only provide through their own initiative and efforts a living for the family, but they must also meet every obligation of a free home owner. At the same time they must also meet every obligation due the mortgage holder and his agents.

About the only advantage this group can boast over the tenant farmer is the pride of home ownership, and that in name only. They labor under a burden which ultimately crushes their freedom and drives them to tenantry and serfdom.

In the transition period, or disintegration, from a home owner free of debt to a tenant farmer, practically all farm families pass through this second or middle stage which we may safely designate as "the mortgage period of metabolism."

First, the home owner free of debt.

Second, the home owner with mortgage.

Third, the tenant farmer.

After tenantry and serfdom comes disintegration and destruction.

We are today dangerously near that period.

STATISTICS SHOW FARMERS RAPIDLY DEGENERATING INTO CONDITION OF SERFDOM

In order that the farmers of this Nation may clearly see the importance of this statement, I wish to remind you that the 1930 census shows there to have been 6,288,648 farmers in this Nation.

First. Home owners reporting free of debt, 1,845,997, or 29.4 percent of total.

Second. Home owners reporting mortgage debt, 1,497,766, or 23.8 percent of total.

Third. Home owners not reporting and managers, 280,520, or 4.4 percent of total.

Fourth. Tenant farmers, 2,664,365, or 42.4 percent of total.

When 1930 figures are compared with previous census years since 1890 it is found that—

First. The percentage of home owners free of debt has steadily decreased.

Second. The percentage of home owners with mortgages has remained practically the same.

Third. The percentage of tenants has steadily increased.

In 1890, of the total farms 48.80 percent were home owners free of debt, 19.1 percent were home owners mortgaged, 3.7 percent showed no report or managers, and 28.4 percent were tenants.

In 1930, 40 years later, the percentages were almost exactly reversed. They show that of the total farms 29.4 percent were home owners free of debt, 23.8 percent were home owners mortgaged, 4.4 percent showed no report or managers, and 42.4 percent were tenants.

In 1890, of the total farmers reporting, 48.8 percent were home owners free of debt, while 47.5 percent of the total farmers were either tenants or home owners with mortgage.

In 1930, of the total farmers reporting, 29.4 percent were home owners free of debt, while 66.2 percent of the total farmers were either tenants or home owners with mortgage.

It is interesting and important to observe that during this 40-year period the percentage of home owners with mortgage, or the middle group, has made but little change. In 1890 it was 19.1 percent of the total farms. In 1930 it was 23.8 percent of the total farms.

THE FARM MORTGAGE IS DESTRUCTIVE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

It thus becomes evident that the farm mortgage is simply the vehicle which conveys the farmer from a condition of home ownership and freedom to one of tenantry and serfdom.

I have made a rather careful search of history and of human nature in an effort to learn of some manner in which this vehicle, the farm mortgage, could be made to go in the opposite direction, and thus convey the farmer back from a condition of tenantry to that of free ownership of his farm home.

My efforts have failed.

Human beings under ordinary conditions do not buy farm lands and pay for them out of the fruits of their labors on the farm purchased. They have never done this in the recorded history of the human race.

The farm mortgage is of no value in reestablishing our farm families in their homes and in regaining for them the purchasing power of their new wealth. It is of no constructive value to anyone, either the borrower or the lender.

The farm mortgage is destructive in its nature. It is, therefore, an enemy to society and should be prohibited. The law which I propose shall accomplish this highly desirable result.

METHODS BY WHICH FARMERS OBTAIN TITLE TO FARM HOMES FREE OF DEBT

If a farmer cannot become a home owner by going in debt, by what method can this result be obtained?

I have been able to learn of only three methods by which farmers, under ordinary conditions, have gained title to their farms free of debt.

First. By forcibly taking them from someone else.

Second. By earning the money with which to pay for them in some other manner than out of the fruits of their labor on the farm.

Third. By having the farm given to them.

The first method, of forcible entry, was that used by our forefathers in gaining this country from the Indians. However, it would hardly be now considered a proper means of reestablishing our farm families in their homes.

The second method, that of earning the purchase price in some other manner than from the soil, was used to a great extent in a portion of this country when the land was covered with forests which were easily and readily removed from the land and sold, thus providing revenue for paying the purchase price. This method is still used to a very small degree by those who earn sufficient funds in some other avenue of endeavor and then purchase their farm and move on it to live. Experience has demonstrated, however, that this method is of small value under normal conditions.

The third method, that of having the farm given to the farm family, is that which was used almost altogether in the settling of this Nation. It has proven itself to be not only a practical method but also a highly desirable one.

It was practiced by the Thirteen Original Colonies after their governments had been established.

Our Nation purchased the fertile midwestern portion of this country from the nation of France. This land was then, in turn, given to farm families.

This method has also been used in establishing farm families in the other portions of this Nation.

SIMPLE METHOD OF LAND DISTRIBUTION PROVIDED IN BILL

It is this same simple method of land distribution that is embodied in this measure. It is the surest and simplest way of restoring to our farmers, the producers of our raw products and our new wealth, their homes, and their right of free access to the soil and to the source of our national existence as a free people.

This method is the most economical, the simplest, and the surest way to restore this Nation to normal prosperity.

Make us again a nation of home owners and we again become a healthy and prosperous nation.

The plan which I have offered here will accomplish this result. It is in harmony with the laws of nature and the divine laws of God.

I am presenting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which shows the actual farm conditions in every State of the Union, giving the number of farmers who own their homes free of debt and the number of farmers whose farms are mortgaged or who are tenants with no title whatever to their farms.

Total land area, farm acreage, and number of farms of specified classes, by States, census of 1930

	Total land area (acres)	Area in farms (acres)	Total number of farms	Farms operated by owners free from debt		Farms of tenants and owners mortgaged		Farms of managers, and owners mortgage status not reported	
				Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
United States.....	1,903,216,640	986,771,016	6,288,648	1,845,997	29.4	4,162,131	66.2	280,520	4.5
Alabama.....	32,818,560	17,554,635	257,395	47,406	18.4	202,837	78.9	7,152	2.8
Arizona.....	72,838,400	10,526,627	14,173	4,822	34.0	5,937	41.8	3,414	24.1
Arkansas.....	33,616,000	16,052,962	242,334	47,494	19.6	186,393	77.0	8,447	3.5
California.....	99,617,280	30,442,581	135,676	43,852	32.3	79,056	58.3	12,768	9.3
Colorado.....	66,341,120	28,876,171	59,956	15,741	26.2	40,708	67.9	3,507	5.8
Connecticut.....	3,084,800	1,502,279	17,195	7,024	40.9	9,066	52.7	1,105	6.4
Delaware.....	1,257,600	900,815	9,707	3,470	35.7	5,689	58.6	548	5.6
District of Columbia.....	39,680	3,071	104	35	33.7	44	42.3	25	24.0
Florida.....	35,111,040	5,026,617	58,966	25,535	43.3	26,457	44.9	6,974	11.8
Georgia.....	37,584,000	22,078,630	255,598	46,479	18.2	199,807	78.2	9,312	3.7
Idaho.....	53,346,560	9,346,908	41,674	11,466	27.5	27,977	67.1	2,231	5.3
Illinois.....	35,867,520	30,695,339	214,497	62,990	29.4	141,941	66.2	9,566	4.4
Indiana.....	23,068,800	19,688,675	181,570	61,731	34.0	111,433	61.4	8,356	4.5
Iowa.....	35,575,040	34,019,332	214,928	41,371	19.3	166,040	77.3	7,517	3.5
Kansas.....	52,335,360	46,975,647	166,042	41,728	25.1	119,405	71.9	4,909	3.0
Kentucky.....	25,715,840	19,927,286	246,499	103,780	42.1	126,601	51.4	16,118	6.6
Louisiana.....	29,061,760	9,355,437	161,445	30,339	18.8	125,231	77.6	5,875	3.7
Maine.....	19,132,800	4,639,938	39,006	22,535	57.8	13,688	35.1	2,783	7.1
Maryland.....	6,262,240	4,374,398	43,203	17,575	40.7	23,089	53.4	2,539	5.9
Massachusetts.....	5,144,960	2,005,461	25,598	9,961	38.9	13,601	53.1	2,036	7.9
Michigan.....	36,787,200	17,118,951	169,372	68,046	40.2	95,168	56.2	6,158	3.6
Minnesota.....	51,749,120	30,913,367	185,255	53,830	29.1	125,708	67.8	5,717	3.1
Mississippi.....	29,671,680	17,332,195	312,663	44,271	14.2	261,408	83.7	6,984	2.2
Missouri.....	43,985,280	33,743,019	255,940	80,056	31.3	169,260	66.1	6,624	2.6
Montana.....	93,523,840	44,659,152	47,495	14,498	30.6	30,620	64.5	2,377	5.0
Nebraska.....	49,157,120	44,708,565	129,458	24,893	19.2	99,981	77.2	4,584	3.5
Nevada.....	70,285,440	4,080,906	3,442	1,332	38.7	1,595	46.3	515	15.0
New Hampshire.....	5,779,840	1,960,061	14,906	7,704	51.7	5,721	38.4	1,481	9.9
New Jersey.....	4,808,960	1,758,027	25,378	9,316	36.7	14,611	57.6	1,451	5.7
New Mexico.....	78,401,920	30,822,034	31,404	15,655	49.9	12,057	38.4	3,692	11.8
New York.....	30,498,560	17,979,633	159,806	68,786	43.0	82,659	51.7	8,361	5.3
North Carolina.....	31,193,600	18,055,103	279,708	89,364	31.9	176,847	63.2	13,497	4.8
North Dakota.....	44,917,120	38,657,894	77,975	14,124	18.1	60,990	78.2	2,861	3.6
Ohio.....	26,073,600	21,514,059	219,296	94,179	42.9	113,692	51.9	11,425	5.2
Oklahoma.....	44,424,960	33,790,817	203,866	31,776	15.6	163,887	80.4	8,203	4.1
Oregon.....	61,188,480	16,548,678	55,153	19,754	35.8	32,860	59.6	2,539	4.6
Pennsylvania.....	28,692,480	15,309,485	172,419	85,616	49.7	75,602	43.9	11,201	6.5
Rhode Island.....	682,880	279,361	3,322	1,619	48.7	1,441	43.4	262	8.0
South Carolina.....	19,516,800	10,393,113	157,931	32,222	20.4	121,088	76.7	4,621	2.9
South Dakota.....	49,195,520	36,470,083	83,157	15,394	18.5	64,381	77.4	3,382	4.0
Tennessee.....	26,679,680	18,003,241	245,657	87,010	35.4	147,935	60.2	10,712	4.3
Texas.....	167,934,720	124,707,130	495,459	99,440	20.1	377,118	76.1	18,931	3.8
Utah.....	52,597,760	5,613,101	27,159	9,488	35.0	15,198	55.9	2,473	9.1
Vermont.....	5,839,360	3,896,097	24,898	9,945	40.0	14,043	56.4	910	3.6
Virginia.....	25,767,080	16,728,620	170,610	87,031	51.1	75,584	44.3	7,995	4.7
Washington.....	42,775,040	13,533,778	70,904	25,774	36.3	40,909	57.7	4,221	5.9
West Virginia.....	15,374,080	8,802,348	82,641	49,259	59.7	26,904	32.6	6,478	7.8
Wisconsin.....	35,363,840	21,874,155	181,767	55,509	30.5	119,801	65.9	6,457	3.6
Wyoming.....	62,430,720	23,525,234	16,011	4,772	29.9	10,013	62.5	1,226	7.6

H. R. 8286 (74th Cong., 1st sess.), in the House of Representatives,
May 31, 1935

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

A bill to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families

Be it enacted, etc., That the purposes of this act are to provide for every family an opportunity to own a home, encourage private initiative, protect each citizen in the enjoyment of the fruits of his labor, and more firmly secure for our people their natural right of pursuit of happiness in freedom and independence.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, through the General Land Office, is hereby authorized—

(a) To purchase any and/or all obligations secured by liens on farm lands, paying for the same an amount not exceeding the normal value of such lands plus the useful value of buildings and improvements thereon.

(b) To settle and liquidate all obligations acquired under this act where the mortgagor is still in possession of such lands and where the total normal value of the lands plus the useful value of the buildings and improvements thereon exceeds the total encumbrances thereon, in the following manner: The mortgagor shall be permitted to retain of the mortgaged lands, free of any such obligation, an amount of the land involved which will equal in value to the difference between (1) the total normal value of the total lands encumbered plus the useful value of buildings and improvements thereon and (2) the total amount of the encumbrances. Such settlement shall be made in such manner as will vest in the General Land Office fee-simple title and possession to the remainder of such lands.

(c) To recognize the right of every mortgagor to carry out the provisions of his obligation, and upon receipt from such mortgagor of complete payment of his obligation and satisfaction of indebtedness according to the terms of his contract, to cancel such obligation and convey it back to the mortgagor.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to purchase fee simple title to any and/or all farm lands held by the mortgagee or lienholder under a foreclosure concluded after January 1, 1920, paying for the same an amount not exceeding the normal value of such lands plus the useful value of buildings and improvements thereon and not exceeding the amount of indebtedness under the mortgage or other lien at the time of foreclosure.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed—

(a) To make all lands coming into possession of the General Land Office under this act a part of the public domain.

(b) To classify all lands in the public domain according to their fertility, adaptability, and usefulness for farm purposes.

(c) To withhold and retain from private ownership all the public domain not suited for farm purposes.

(d) To divide all public lands suitable for farm purposes into tracts, to be known as homesteads, of suitable size for the support of a family of average size under normal conditions, taking into consideration the fertility of the soil and general farm conditions and requirements in the section where said lands are located in determining the size of such tracts.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior, through the General Land Office, is hereby authorized and directed to grant homesteads provided for in this act to any person who is the head of a family, subject to the following terms and conditions:

(a) The applicant must have met the general requirements of the homestead acts now in force, not inconsistent with this act, before homestead under this act may be granted.

(b) Preference must be given to farm families living on farms at the time this act goes into effect—a prior right in mortgagors living on encumbered lands at the time of liquidation of indebtedness to acquire homestead within the bounds of said encumbered lands shall be recognized as a fundamental policy of this act.

Sec. 6. (a) Homestead grants shall include only the rights of possession and use of the lands included in such homestead tract, but such rights shall be just as full and complete as though the lands were held under fee-simple title.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall provide regulations whereby homestead grants provided for in this act may be exchanged.

(c) No person shall be permitted, at any given time, to have title to more than one homestead tract under this act.

(d) No person who is the owner of farm land shall be granted a homestead under this act.

(e) Authority to sell, encumber, or in any manner make such homestead tract subject to any debt shall not be granted and is hereby prohibited as a fundamental policy of this act, and any exercise of or attempt to exercise any such power is hereby declared to be void and of no legal effect.

(f) Homestead grants, under this act, shall be free except that a nominal registration fee of not exceeding \$10 may be charged.

Sec. 7. (a) The laws, including those relating to taxation, of any State or political subdivision in which any lands coming into the possession of the Secretary of the Interior under the terms of this act are situated shall apply in the case of such lands in the same manner and to the same extent as such laws apply in the case of privately owned lands.

(b) Upon failure of any owner of homestead grant under this act to meet all such obligations on the lands held under such homo-

stead grant, his rights under said grant shall be forfeited and shall revert to the General Land Office, and said Office shall have power to eject the owner from possession and repossess such lands, making them again eligible for entry by other qualified applicants under this act.

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and intent of this act.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—MINORITY VIEWS

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have 5 days in which to present minority views on the bill (H. R. 7120) respecting the deportation of aliens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOURS AND CONDITIONS OF LABOR

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a constitutional amendment, which I have introduced this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the House and urge the support of all liberal Members for my resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to establish minimum wages in any employment, and to regulate production, industry, business, trade, and commerce to prevent unfair methods and practices therein.

This is a companion bill to Senate Joint Resolution 3, introduced in the Senate on January 4, 1935 by Senator COSTIGAN, of Colorado. I take no credit for it, but I am in complete accord with its purpose.

In view of the decision of the Supreme Court on the N. R. A., it becomes evident that the Constitution must be amended if Congress is to be free to cope with the existing economic problems.

If our democratic and constitutional form of government is to prevail, the Congress must have the unquestioned power to regulate industry and commerce in such a way as to protect the workers, the consumers, and the investors. Unless a government can meet the problems of the machine age by legislation which will enable the workers to make a living, such a government will fail. Political rights are meaningless if economic rights are not recognized and protected. The very life of the mass of our people is dependent upon a security of employment, fair wages, and fair living costs.

This is what the N. R. A. was designed to secure for our people. It has in the less than 2 years of its operation raised the wages of millions of workers, shortened the hours of labor, shut out child labor, and eliminated most of the unfair methods and practices that were ruining alike the employer and the employee.

No thinking American can fail to agree with me that we must not give up the ground we have gained, but must march forward in the onslaught on unemployment and all its attendant evils.

The N. R. A. was predicated on the proposition that legitimate business could be so conducted as to afford good wages for the workers, reasonable hours of employment, and a fair profit on the capital invested. To achieve this it was absolutely necessary to impose restrictions on all industry in order to prevent a minority from taking advantage of the majority of right-thinking employers who had come to realize that business can prosper only when purchasing power is available to the worker.

The N. R. A. checked and attempted to outlaw the activities of the chiseler, whose cutthroat methods and practices made it impossible for honest business and industry to carry on under fair rules.

While Congress may be able to write a new N. R. A. law in which definite standards for the codes are clearly stated, there will always be the uncertainty as to how the Supreme Court will act on this. It is unfair to business, to labor, and

to the entire public to leave any uncertainty as to the validity of such acts as the public welfare clearly demands.

That the public welfare demands that Congress shall have the power to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to require codes of fair business practice is clear. We who believe in the soundness of our democratic constitutional system feel that it now faces a major crisis. We also believe that our system can meet that crisis and prove itself able to meet the problems of our machine age efficiently, and thus insure to all of our people that equal opportunity which the Constitution guarantees. Unless we can regulate business so that it can pay living wages and employ all of our employable people, thus enabling us to use our resources and our productive power for the benefit of all our people, we shall face such a storm as may wreck our beloved country and the democratic principles for which it has so long stood.

Since certain direct ways are barred or made difficult, through the decision of the Supreme Court, we must take the harder but surer method by placing an amendment to the Constitution before the people for their approval or rejection. They will approve and will be glad to do so.

For most of them agree with Mr. Edward A. Filene, who says:

As I understand the decision, the depression is perfectly constitutional, but organized, planned recovery is not.

Most of them will favor a change in the Constitution by which plenty may be equitably distributed in a democracy.

It devolves upon Congress to meet the situation courageously and intelligently. Let us make this needed change to our Constitution and thus insure the blessings of liberty to our people and prove our ability to master the new problems of a new age.

I have complete confidence in the high principles of the membership of this House. I believe that in the face of this crisis we will act. We must not falter. We must not procrastinate. We must act promptly, vigorously, and wisely so that the blessings of liberty may be retained for our people.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a Memorial Day address which I delivered yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a Memorial Day address delivered by me on May 30, 1935, Haines Point, in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., under the auspices of Admiral Robert E. Peary Ship No. 427, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad to come here today and in my humble way have some little part in observing this seventy-second annual Memorial Day service now being observed throughout the Nation.

We are glad to honor and pay tribute to those of our comrades who have made the supreme sacrifice and have passed on to the great beyond. We have not always celebrated a Memorial or Decoration Day in our country. I believe it is fitting and proper to relate the history of this great holy day set aside to honor our dead.

In April 1863 a little group of southern women, after 2 years of sorrowful, weary waiting and in fond remembrance of a father, brother, husband, or sweetheart, had journeyed to the graveyard near Columbus, Miss., and there decorated the graves of their loved ones. One elderly lady of the group, after she had finished decorating the graves of her two sons who had lost their lives in defense of the southern cause, was seen walking over toward a corner of the churchyard where lie buried two unknown Union soldiers.

One of the ladies of the group asked her what she was doing.

"Do you forget," said the first woman, "whose graves those are?"

"They are two Union soldiers—they are Yankees who"—

"Hush," said the mother of the two heroes, "you are wrong; I do not forget. They are nameless graves marking where two soldiers lie buried, but somewhere in the North in some little city, or village, or perhaps in some lonely farmhouse, a mother or a young wife or a sweetheart mourns for them, just as you and I grieve for the loss of our loved ones." She turned back to the unmarked grave and stooped down, gently she pushed aside the

long grass, cleared the grave, and tenderly spread her flowers over the two mounds. With tears in her eyes but with her head held proudly she faced the women who had silently gathered about her.

"We bring these flowers," she pointed to the graves of her sons, then to the others decked with blossoms, "to express our love and devotion. They are dead, our heroes of the South; they are dead, these unknown soldiers of the North, lying here in our churchyard at Columbus, in nameless graves. But when the war is over and peace comes again, we shall call them our heroes. So here are my lilacs and roses—red, white, and blue for both alike."

"And mine."

"And mine."

"And mine, too," said the other women softly as they added their flowers to the lovely blossoms on the unmarked graves in the corner of the churchyard.

The next April the women of Columbus, Miss., in increasing numbers repeated this beautiful deed, and they continued these rites year after year, although with each year the privations and sufferings of the war were greater and the losses of the South more irreparable. More and more graves filled the churchyard—brave southerners who fell at Vicksburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, and in the Wilderness; yes, and graves of brave northerners who died fighting in the South, fighting for the Union. Each succeeding year more women joined the memorial services and went to the graveyard and decorated the graves of the soldiers—those who wore the blue as well as those who wore the gray. Each mound in the cemetery was decorated. From these acts of these good women of Columbus, Miss., came the most beautiful of our holidays.

In 1867 the New York Tribune printed this story of how these southern women had decorated the graves of all soldiers who had fallen—those from the North as well as those from the South—and the story was published throughout the Nation. In 1868 Gen. John A. Logan, then commander of the G. A. R., issued an order naming May 30 as the Decoration Day for the graves of our soldiers; and this custom has been continued throughout the Nation since that time. The different States in the South have different days set aside for this purpose, but all States join in this solemn, patriotic observance. Throughout the Nation, each city, town, and part of the country have sent their sons to all the different wars our Nation has experienced. Many of these sons have failed to return, and the decoration of the graves of our loved ones throughout the years has been an effective agency in helping heal the scars of the Civil War as well as the wars since then.

In 1899 the veterans of the Spanish War began decorating the graves of their comrades. In 1919 the veterans of the World War who lie buried on the battlefields of France have found the same loving response by the French peasants, who come and decorate the graves of our American boys who died overseas.

In just a few moments a beautiful poppy anchor will be cast into the Potomac in revered memory of those who have gone down to the sea in ships. A little later today we will decorate the grave of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery and in so doing pay our respects to all of those heroes who gave their all in defense of their country in the last great war.

Other nations observe some memorial ceremony. The Greeks' impressive rites, called "Zoi", are performed over each grave. The Romans had a special festival in honor of their dead called the "Parentalia" or "the day of the fathers."

England, France, and other European countries have similar services in honor of their dead heroes.

In China and Japan they have ancestral worship.

Hate, malice, or greed for gold have been largely responsible for all wars of the past. It seems that periodically we have always had war, and if our actions in the past are to continue to mark the course of the future we shall continue to be torn by such conflicts. If the nations of the world could be made to understand and follow the teachings of the great Master, "Love thy neighbor as thyself", as the Good Book teaches that we should, this would stop all such future conflicts; then we could beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks. The millions of dollars each nation is spending for national defense would be unnecessary and all of these great sums thus expended could and would be used for the economic and social betterment of mankind. Peace would be truly ours. However, until we can make such progress we must be adequately prepared to defend ourselves against all nations, whomsoever.

Let us not forget the mistakes of the past; but let us be ever mindful of our duties to our Government, to see that the same honest, patriotic service is rendered by the manufacturers of our national defense equipment as is rendered by the great masses of the people who are periodically called to the colors to render their patriotic, unselfish services for the defense of the principles of government that we all hold so dear. Let us not forget on Memorial Day our departed comrades. Let us pledge anew our loyalty to our flag while we honor the memory of the men who have died for it. Let us also remember that many of our comrades lie buried in unmarked and undecorated graves.

Cover the thousand who sleep far away—

Sleep where their friends cannot find them today;

They who, in mountain and hillside and dell,

Rest where they wearied and lie where they fell.

Softly the grass blade creeps round their repose,
Sweetly above them the wild flowret blows;
Zephyrs of freedom fly gently o'erhead,
Whispering names for the patriot dead.

So in our minds we will name them once more,
So in our hearts we will cover them o'er;
Roses and lilies and violets blue
Bloom in our souls for the brave and the true.

Cover them over—yes; cover them over—
Parent and husband, brother and lover;
Think of those far-away heroes of ours,
And cover them over with beautiful flowers.

MODERNIZE THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is a phrase that refers to "beating the living with the bones of the dead."

This phrase applies with graphic—and perhaps gruesome—force to the present situation when a Constitution of the eighteenth century prevents millions of men, women, and children in the twentieth century from enjoying the benefits of laws aiming at providing a larger share of social justice.

In the Washington Post of May 30 Raymond Clapper, discussing the situation arising from the decision of the Supreme Court regarding the N. R. A. and the Frazier-Lemke law, well says that the various factors "make it even more ridiculous for persons to be saying that the Supreme Court has cleared up everything and we can go back where we were and that everything will work out if just let alone."

The Supreme Court instead of clearing up everything has done the reverse—unless something specific is done to put government really in the hands of the people who produce. In another sense, maybe it has cleared up everything—for it has, by giving us a Nation-wide jolt, made it evident that certain fundamental changes are inevitable.

Permit me to repeat my assertion of May 29 that two amendments to the Constitution of the United States are imperative: One enabling the Government to take any steps it finds necessary to assure every able-bodied, full-grown citizen engaged in useful labor of the comforts of life, as well as to assure the same to the disabled, sick, aged, and minors; and another making it impossible in the future for the Supreme Court to block humanitarian laws by branding them unconstitutional.

It is gratifying to note that the idea of the necessity of altering the Nation's basic law so that it will fit the needs of the time is meeting with considerable favor and has been endorsed by various Members of Congress within the last day or two. The constitutional amendment offered by Senator COSTIGAN at the beginning of the session expressly authorizing Congress to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to establish minimum wages in any employment and to regulate production, industry, business, trade, and commerce, to prevent unfair methods and practices therein, may be sufficient to serve the purpose. However, we should bear in mind that the amendment ought to be clear, definite, and comprehensive enough so that never again shall we find ourselves fettered when we attempt to legislate in the interest of the common people of our country. By all means, the amendment should leave no doubt as to the Government's authority to socialize any industry, whether it be railroads, as provided in the Wheeler bill, or others. Able lawyers have sometimes maintained that the law of eminent domain would cover this, but after the latest experience with the Supreme Court we can afford to take no further chances. It is a safe assumption that the present high tribunal would never sustain such an interpretation of the law of eminent domain. It might also be a long time before any other Supreme Court in the United States would do so. If the Constitution is to be amended, let us play safe and draw up an amendment that will unmistakably establish the right of the people to have both an industrial democracy and a political democracy.

It is well to mention that in a period like this, when the citizenship of the country has come to look at social justice laws in a different light than that in which they regarded

them some years ago, a constitutional amendment might not require such a long time, after all. Especially so when millions of Americans are firmly resolved that they do not want to return to the tragic days of the regime of Herbert Hoover and that they want to see poverty fully and finally eliminated.

We decided to get rid of prohibition, you know. Less than 10 months were required to secure the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Perhaps far less than that would be needed to write into the Constitution articles legalizing measures to keep people from going hungry, homeless, and ragged.

I have previously referred to the reactionary nature of most of the decisions of the Supreme Court. They have usually been rulings that protected the owners of vast wealth. They have also frequently been one-man decisions—that is, decisions by a vote of 5 to 4. Bryan, speaking of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the income-tax law as unconstitutional by a 5-to-4 vote in 1893, after one of the Justices who was originally favorable had taken a different view, said, "We can't be expected to know when a judge is going to change his mind." I could add that there is no reason in science, nature, or logic why this Nation of over 100,000,000 people should have to care what any judge thinks if it genuinely wants to enact a humanitarian statute.

There is considerable merit in Congressman LEMKE's plan to allow passing a major legislative measure by direct referendum of the people if 5 percent of the voters petition for it. This would enable the voters to enact a law regardless of congressional action if they were unable to get their representatives in the national lawmaking body to obey the popular will. Such legislation would also be unassailable by the Supreme Court, it appears. Nevertheless, even if the Lemke proposal should be approved, there would remain the necessity of amending the Constitution to obviate further interference by the Supreme Court with economic security measures.

It is a well-known fact that no court in England ever presumes to declare an act of Parliament unconstitutional. Haines, in his American Doctrine of Judicial Supremacy, even says:

Authorities seem to accord in the opinion that there is no specific case on record in which an English court of justice has openly taken upon itself to overrule or disregard the plain meaning of an act of Parliament.

In 1799 in our own country, Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, went emphatically on record against judicial interference with legislation. He said:

Upon no subject am I more convinced that it is an unsafe and dangerous doctrine in a republic ever to suppose that a judge ought to possess the right of questioning or deciding upon the constitutionality of treaties, laws, or any act of the legislature. It is placing the opinion of an individual or of two or three above that of both branches of Congress; a doctrine which is not warranted by the Constitution and will not, I hope, long have many advocates in this country.

Abraham Lincoln, in his first inaugural address, declared:

* * * At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain that request.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered at Arlington yesterday by my colleague from Connecticut, Mr. KOPPLEMANN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Memorial Day address by Hon. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, of Connecticut, at Arlington National Cemetery, Washington, D. C., May 30, 1935, as follows:

Another Memorial Day has rolled around and once more Americans the world over are pausing in reverence for the memory of comrades, friends, and relatives who have made the supreme sacrifice for humanity. We in particular are joined in service to honor the memory of Vincent Bambarly Costello, who was the first employee of the government of the District of Columbia to fall in combat during the World War.

The tragedy of the early death of this young man, the sorrow which his passing brought to his family and his friends, the tragic end which came to his fiancée, who herself died of grief shortly after the message arrived telling that Vincent Bambarly Costello was killed in action, merely exemplified the thousands of similar tragedies which were experienced by families the world over as each day brought messages from "over there" dealing out the sinister words, "Killed in action."

It is to the credit and to the glory of this country that we have never willingly sought war. We have never entered war for the purpose of commercial advantage nor of national expansion. Neither greed nor selfishness has ever motivated our entrance into war. Always it was because this Nation was impelled to enter war for the sake of preserving the freedom of our people and the freedom of others.

To defend their liberty, the choicest heritage of man, the Thirteen Colonies revolted against their mother country, England. That revolt, attended by privation and hardship inconceivable to those of us who have known the softer ways of living, but not unknown to you who were over there during the World War, produced a nation consecrated to freedom which opened its doors as a haven for the persecuted and the downtrodden of the world.

We grant no dukedoms to the few
We hold like rights . . .
Each honest man shall have his vote
Each child shall have his school.

Refugees from other countries, whether they came to this land because they sought freedom from religious persecution or the opportunity of self-advancement, built and expanded this Nation from an immense, undeveloped region to a nation which today has no peer.

A divine Providence must itself have approved the motives which led this country into conflict with other nations, must surely have given its seal of approval that we were in the right, because victory has attended every combat in which we have ever engaged. Thus it was with the War of 1812; thus it was with the skirmishes with Mexico and the frontier battles when our pioneers left civilized places of habitation to open up unknown and untraveled regions of our land.

In 1861 a serious threat menaced the unity and progress of our Nation when the Civil War broke out and States fought States. Severance of this country into separate divisions, each under different forms of government and under different flags, is unthinkable.

The war which kept the country whole ended successfully for that section which sought to keep the country under one flag. Time has erased the bitterness which caused the rift between the States. In the painful period of reconstruction the South was aided by the more plentiful resources of the North. Progress and development were shared alike by all, and when the tremendous holocaust of 1914 swept over the world, America, strong in its unity of 48 States, stood ready as one nation.

But war at best does not help civilization. Every war sets us back for generations. Its toll is inestimable. Money which is spent in building munitions machinery to slaughter the people of other nations is money ill spent. Money which is spent to build ships to wage battles on sea could better be used to foster the commercial and the cultural growth of our people. Money spent to teach the youth of our land to kill the youth of other lands is money squandered in maintaining and promoting a barbarism which should long, long ago have been relegated to the dusty pages of our earliest history.

You members of the Vincent B. Costello Post have been through war. You know its horrors, you know its ordeals, you know its futility and its desperation. Today there is a battle going on in this country. It is a battle for peace. Is it possible that we have reached this year of 1935, thousands of years along in the development of civilization, and that still nations cannot sit down in counsel to settle their difficulties without hurling their young into a bloody struggle in which death is the victor?

"Every one of you won the war,
But you, you dead, most of all."

Before us there are three graves, side by side. The one is of the man whose memory will forever live through the existence of the Vincent B. Costello Post. On either side of him are two friends of carefree school days. Vincent Bambarly Costello himself was only 28 years old when he was killed while serving with a raiding party in the Vosges (Vozsh) Mountains. Thousands of other American men of his age, and even younger, lost their lives in that same futile conflict of which this raid was but a small part. Must this sort of thing go on? Will there never come a time when even one generation can go on peacefully from

birth to death without throwing the youth of the world into the caldron of war?

In Europe they are again arming. Everywhere they are planning for the next war. Always statesmen are talking of peace, and all the while the munitions factories are turning out their contribution, and young men, who were babes in arms when their fathers were killed during the last war, are receiving military training, equipping themselves for the next war and death. The children of today will be the victims of the next war. In some lands even women and girls are being trained to go into the trenches.

The gratitude of an entire nation goes out to those who gave their lives in the cause. No less glowing should the tribute be to those of you who are living, for you were there ready to make the supreme sacrifice, and only by the grace of Providence were you saved. Tragic is the lot of you who came back disabled, who for the rest of your lives will carry a scar perpetually reminding you of those days and weeks and months of marching, disease, mud, hunger, and the zero hour which took you over the top into No Man's Land, from which so many never returned.

But that is in the past, and we as Americans must forever keep our eyes to the future, for that is where progress lies. I commend you and praise you for what you have done. No one better than you knows the terror and the futility of war. That is the reason why you are the men who can best be called into the leadership in today's war against war.

The valor and the sense of sportsmanship which buoyed up the spirit of Vincent Bambarly Costello when he was separated from his family and his loved ones was the same courage and good sportsmanship each one of you displayed. Your thoughts were not for yourselves, they were for those who were left behind. The greatest sorrow and the heaviest burden was upon those whose boys came back on Government transports wrapped in flags.

Memorial Day should forever be observed. Not alone because we who remained at home want this day set aside to do you honor but as a constant reminder that there must never again be reason for adding another to the already long list of wars that call for Memorial Days.

During the war as a civilian I was active in the service of the country. I do not often mention my war record. I would to God there had never been need for such a record. All through the war, even while I was serving my country, I longed and prayed for the day when peace would be restored in order that the citizens of this country could join in the mighty task for a permanent world peace. If we cannot dictate to other nations we can keep peace within our own borders. We can refuse to enter a war with any other nation unless invaded. Keeping the peace is the task of the American people and, in particular, it is the task of every man and woman who had a part in former wars.

Vincent Bambarly Costello gave his life for his country, for freedom and to save the world for democracy. His life will have been given in vain unless you, his comrades, and his thousands of other comrades throughout the country, take up the new war for everlasting peace.

WHY "CHISEL" THE CONSTITUTION WHEN THE CONSTITUTION
WILL POSITIVELY SAVE OUR COUNTRY

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I have the fullest confidence in the integrity and the ability of the representatives of the people to initiate and enact legislation free from outside interference, and I condemn and abhor the enactment of legislation which is initiated and drafted by synthetic and capitalistic economists who have been appointed—not elected—in the new deal.

I am not an economist, nor am I an attorney; but I am American enough to believe that when our forefathers wrote the Constitution and adopted it, they gave us a document which we may well observe in the interest of justice, freedom, and democracy. It is not necessary to chisel away the foundation stones of the Constitution through the adroit use of words, terms, and phrases in order to attain national recovery. Positive national recovery may be brought to our Nation without destroying in the least any portion of our Constitution, and, in my opinion, the Congress may well be censured for not observing the precepts of the Constitution and for failing to exercise the right and the responsibility to coin money and regulate the value thereof granted to Congress in our Constitution.

I am convinced that we can take every alphabetical organization of the new deal and drop them into the darkest oblivion and that our recovery will be assured, provided the Government will take over at least 51 percent of the stock of all banks, permitting private individuals to own the remaining 49 percent. Certainly no banker who is honest, who patriotically believes in his country, and is concerned

over the welfare of our people should oppose selling to the Government bank stock at its present par value. The truth is that the Government today owns just about this amount of stock in all the banks. Therefore, the private financier would suffer no handicap. With the Government owning 51 percent of the stock of all banks and the private financiers 49 percent, and the management of the banks thus divided, the profits accruing to the banking structure should be divided also upon this ratio, with the stipulation, however, that in no event would the private financier receive more than 10 percent of bank profit on his actual cash investments.

Under a plan such as I propose, the enormous profits accruing to our banking structure, under our present system, which profits are based entirely on our own governmental extension of credit, would come into the pockets of the people rather than into the pockets of the private financiers, as today applies. Why the banker, under existing laws, should be authorized to extend credit in an amount from 10 to 22½ times more than his actual cash reserve and to reap an inordinate interest profit on this fictitious or fountain-pen credit is beyond my comprehension. I cannot believe that the Congress is so blind that it does not recognize this inordinate subsidy which goes into the pockets of the private bankers each year.

In addition to the socialization of banking, Congress should enact the provisions of the Goldsborough bill in order to save the taxpayers approximately \$1,000,000,000 of interest payments per year on our national debt. Also, the Goldsborough proposal for a commodity dollar should be enacted into law in the interest of a square deal to the small business man and the worker. Both of these Goldsborough measures are admittedly constitutional. Through a socialized bank structure, controlled by the Government somewhat along the lines indicated in the Sweeney-Nye bill, it will be possible to maintain the commodity dollar, thus preventing our small business men, farmers, and workers from being mulcted of their savings and investments through periodic depressions, all of which have been manipulated by the private financiers who control our present banking structure.

Until "Crackdown" Gen. Hugh Johnson and others of the "brain trust" group evidence a sincere "cracking down on the profiteers of finance I feel that all their other suggestions are puerile and merely sepulchral echoings of the financial group who have enslaved the American people and who wish to divert attention from their nefarious acts by proposing artificial—and I wish to reaffirm that they are absolutely artificial—schemes, such as the N. R. A., the A. A. A., and other alphabetical agencies which thrive only under the stimulus of governmental coercion.

Private business can resume its proper functions and competition may again enter the realm of business in a free and open market, provided we will exercise the intelligence to free the American people from the hold which the private banking group now has on the entire business structure of America. Under a socialized banking plan the people themselves—that is, the Government—will have this control and the benefits accruing will redound to the interest of the people.

The private bankers, who oppose Government control of the banking structure, also oppose any interference with the monopoly which is theirs through their control of the machine in our present progressive machine age.

A FAIRY TALE WHICH CAN BE REALIZED

Those of us who have been listening to the ballyhoo of "Crackdown" General Johnson and who have witnessed the ineffective legislation of the Congress may well consider the following fairy tale before proceeding further on the road to chaos. This fairy tale pertains to a manufacturer whom we shall call "Jones", whose principles, fortunately, were not of the Morgan type nor of those of Andy Mellon, who, paradoxically enough, is the kind of humanitarian who robs the people with one hand and with the other gives millions to the churches and to art.

This manufacturer, Jones, made dingbats which may be considered somewhat along the order of clothespins, bathing caps, or can openers—only different. He had a great factory that gave employment to 1,000 working men and women. He paid his workers good wages and they were very happy, contented, and loyal to their big-hearted boss.

One day an efficiency man from Wall Street came into the factory and said to Jones:

"Jones, you must modernize your plant. I can furnish you with machines that will turn out those dingbats in less time than your workers can possibly make them. Why, I can reduce your working force to 400 men. Just see how much extra profit you would make that way."

"Oh, no," answered Jones, who was a conscientious man and a member of the church; "I would never do that. What would happen to the other 600 people? They would starve if I did not employ them in my factory, or else the Government would have to put them on the dole. No; I can't do that. I must provide for my people. I can't take the bread from their mouths, for they would curse me."

They debated the matter at great length, but, while the salesman used his most persuasive arguments, Jones was adamant. He would not do injury to his working people, even though it meant greater profits for himself.

Finally the salesman, who was a very resourceful young fellow and had studied ethics in college, hit upon an idea.

"I have it!" he exclaimed to Jones. "You buy the machines for producing these dingbats, but, instead of discharging the extra 600 men, just shorten the working hours of all the employees so that each one will have to work only about half as long. You can keep their wages just the same as they were before you put in the machines. After all, these people must live. They have to feed and clothe their families and educate their children."

Jones was delighted at this solution of the problem, and, being by nature a progressive man, he immediately bought the machines and had them installed. Soon the men were working shorter hours and even more dingbats were being turned out, so that they were all very happy and praised their boss as an upright and just employer; and to show their affection for him they bought him a red upholstered sofa and chair for his birthday, and he made a nice speech to them and they all went to their homes filled with contentment.

Soon all the other manufacturers of the country, seeing how the plan had worked out, also bought labor-saving machinery to make their dingbats and their thing-a-ma-jigs. And the people all praised their employers and said, "See what progress the machine has brought about. Is not this a wonderful machine age?" And they all bought abundantly of the goods the factories produced, and prices were good, and everybody was prosperous and happy because they all had good jobs and enough income to buy everything they needed. And so they all lived happily ever after.

WHAT REALLY OCCURS UNDER CAPITALISM

Mr. Speaker, the fairy tale which I have related could be a true story; but, unfortunately, it is only a fairy tale. There is not a word of truth in it. Jones did not really behave the way I have described him—no, not by 40,000 dingbats. Let me tell you what the Joneses and all the other big industrial men of America really have been doing. They have installed power-driven machinery in their factories, and because of the efficiency of the machines they have turned workers into the streets by the hundreds and by the thousands. They have put women and even children at the controls of the machines, because women and children can be had for less wages than men. They have driven the wages down and speeded the machines up under the N. R. A., until today there are 30,000,000 of God's people idle and desperate—kept from starvation only by the meager dole which a kindly but bewildered Government offers them from loans obtained from the machine owners in return for tax-exempt securities.

And now by the irony of fate—or possibly by divine dispensation, who knows?—the Joneses and the other industrial men cannot sell their dingbats and their thing-a-ma-jigs to these 30,000,000 dependents of the Government, because the

people no longer earn wages and have scarcely any buying power. There are no foreign markets either, because the dingbat makers in Japan and elsewhere have also put in machinery (sold to them by our international bankers), and are trying to unload their surplus here in America. Unfortunately, under the reciprocal-trade agreements and the free-trade attitude of the administration, the foreigner is now invading our market and adding to our unemployment problem. The Government has borrowed nearly all the surplus money it can get from the dingbat makers and their banker friends, and now the Government is about at the end of the rope—with inflation and collapse just around the corner, while the new deal calls for additional billions for relief and other doles.

TAXING THE MACHINE—A SUBSTANTIAL CURE

Mr. Speaker, this is a heck of a mess, you no doubt will agree. It is a mess, but not hopeless. I made a speech on April 13 in the House advocating the technotax—that is, a tax on the machines according to the workers they displace. The technotax is a simple little word. It means just one thing—tax the machines. If we will tax Jones and all the other manufacturers using labor-saving machines which displace workers, we will do more toward recovery than has thus far been advanced under the new deal. This tax should be graduated according to the workers each machine puts out of a job. With the funds thus derived we could employ several million men in public works—building roads, reforesting the hillsides, constructing bridges, digging ditches, guarding dangerous crossings, and doing a hundred other necessary tasks.

The Joneses would find it expensive to pay taxes on the new machines and would stop buying so many of them. In a short time there would not be an unemployed abled-bodied man or woman in America. Business would pick up and farmers would be able to sell their products at good prices again, because the people would have buying power, and there would be no more reason, in the name of relief, to float tax-exempt bonds for which they and their children's children must pay. This awful depression would be less difficult to surmount, provided we controlled the agencies which brought on the depression and turned them to the service of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this is no fairy tale. This is just plain common sense. The plan has been worked out by practical economists and business men. I am indebted to the American Technotax Society, of Whittier, Calif., for the details of the plan. They have done a great deal of investigating and have spent considerable effort and expense in advancing the technotax idea as a recovery measure. They are cooperating with me 100 percent in my efforts.

Since making my speech on this subject in the House on April 13, and my radio address over the National Broadcasting System on May 17, I have found numerous societies and organizations which are in favor of this permanent and sensible means of recovery. Technotax is a concrete, sensible program, and the best part of it is that it will work.

I have introduced in Congress a bill asking for an appropriation of \$100,000 to conduct a survey of machine-created unemployment. This step is necessary to provide Congress with the essential data for technotax legislation. An able, nonpartisan commission should be chosen to gather this data to be used as a basis for the enactment of graduated taxes on machinery.

Technotax is simple, honest justice to the workingmen and equally fair to the manufacturer and the public. It is in accord with the ethics of the Bible—from each according to his ability.

We should insist that the benefits of machine production and the products of labor be more equitably distributed among all the people. Technotax will wipe out unemployment, reduce our mounting national debt, and take relief burdens off the shoulders of the taxpayers. It will stabilize business by breaking up the vicious competitive circle which is destroying American industry with its own efficiency. Tax the machines according to the workers they displace.

It is the only means known for getting the power-driven machine geared into time with the needs of humanity.

In conclusion, it is my candid opinion that we are today on the very precipice of a momentous decision. Capitalism or communism—which will we have? The question at issue is—Will the capitalistic system be retained in a modified form which will provide for a more equitable distribution of wealth under the stimulus of individual initiative, or must we resort to the other alternative of Government ownership of the machines and the abolition of the capitalistic system of profit? We have gone too far. There is no half-way measure and no turning back. We are definitely and positively at the crossroads. Taxing the machines according to the workers they displace and the control of credit through the socialization of banking offer the solution to our present dilemma and would outlaw as absolutely unnecessary our present ineffective new-deal attempts to bring about recovery.

THE PRESENT NATIONAL CRISIS—THE SUPREME COURT, N. R. A., AND T. V. A.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a subject which is probably one of the most important, if not the most important, before the American people. It concerns the powers of the Supreme Court; and the occasion of my talk is its recent decisions on the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Frazier-Lemke act, and the Humphrey case.

My original intention was to speak on the Tennessee Valley Authority, but I will first make some observations on the Supreme Court and will then discuss the T. V. A. in its wider implications, with its bearings on other projects of the United States, as well as its connection with the institutions and hope of progress in this country.

These decisions that came from the Supreme Court the other day, invalidating the Frazier-Lemke bill for farm mortgages and all of the N. R. A., struck like lightning right in the middle of the United States and have brought up questions of so serious a nature that they have startled the entire American people.

Personally, I believe that we face one of the gravest crises in our national history. And none of our problems can be solved by bellowing, shouting, or bragging; by selfish business psychology, or by political demagoguery. The time has come when the people must recognize the possibilities of our national situation. You know, of course, that in holding the N. R. A. and all codes unconstitutional, illegal, and inoperative, practically all regulation of industry by the Nation has ceased.

The N. R. A. was originally advocated by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as a conservative antidote to statutory minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws, which were being considered in Congress at that time. The employers of America were frankly frightened at the prospect of a nation overrun by hordes of desperate, hungry, unemployed men, women, and children. In their anxiety to get insurance on the survival of property our employers traded some rudimentary social legislation for a relief from the anti-trust laws and a relief from the gnawing fear of rioting. The code of fair competition, which is an American expression for the European price cartel, brought increased profits to most lines of industry, but the social phases of the legislation made imminent the unpleasant danger of having to share some of these increased profits with employees.

Like a child frightened by the dark, American industry and finance ran to its parent, the Government, for protection in 1933. Like the same child, growing ever more boastful in the daylight, industry has spent the past year boasting that it neither needed nor wanted the guidance of its parent. The spoiled child has again had its way, with the Supreme Court's help. If the situation were not tragic, it would be amusing to read the already panicky squeals of the Chamber of Com-

merce to its members to be sure to live up to the provisions of the unconstitutional codes.

If we can survive a protracted period of no N. R. A., and practically no protective laws, without falling into a depression which will make the past 5 years child's play, the revocation of the N. R. A. may be beneficial to the extent that it will force our public servants to get off the easy bandwagon of Roosevelt partisanship and to bring before the people of this country the real economic issues with which we are faced. If Mr. Roosevelt will follow the clear mandate of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court and turn the attention of the various new-deal legal staffs to a vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, it will quickly be plain whether or not American industry really wants rugged independence.

We failed in the N. R. A., now we know what we could have had, yet we also know that if Congress cannot legislate we can have nothing.

Of course, I personally feel that a constitutional convention should be called as quickly as is humanly possible to consider our unique situation of the elected Representatives of the people being unable to pass legislation for the betterment of the people. Unfortunately, our Constitution was developed by and for 13 semi-independent rural colonies in the days before the development of machines and effective transportation and communication made this into one nation. The Supreme Court of the United States is a valuable safeguard of American liberties. Unfortunately, however, it necessarily lags behind in the kaleidoscopic change of conditions of American life. At a time when these changes are rapid and violent, the Supreme Court must be made more responsive to the actual needs of the people, as is our Congress.

It is granted that the N. R. A. was far from perfect, but none but the very old and tired, or the very young and inexperienced, will throw away even an imperfect mechanism, contrived to render a vital service until a better machinery has been found. No longer is it intelligent to attempt to separate which parts of our business do or do not affect interstate business. Were such a scheme practical, the regulation of wages and hours on interstate projects, without identical regulation of intrastate labor would be in effect a special tariff on interstate commerce, and obviously unfair.

One of the most serious effects of the abolition of the N. R. A. is the loss of the effective power of the labor-relations boards. The evidences of internal economic struggle are written into the history of every ancient and modern nation. The principal difference between labor troubles in this country and in many other countries is that here labor has a chance to be articulate while in many places what we call "labor troubles" is called "revolution", and is arbitrated with machine guns. It is never difficult to beat down local labor troubles with clubs and tear gas and other modern conveniences. Bitter economic struggles always have a tendency toward violence, but if that violence is too successfully employed by one side alone, it will eventually take deep enough root to support a full-grown revolution. Surely the pages of history are plain enough to prove to us that labor problems have never been permanently solved by force, and for this country to scrap the gradually developing system of labor-board arbitration and mediation and return to the jungle law of force is a shocking backward step in civilization from which this country will not speedily recover.

I think that I have made myself clear in discussing the N. R. A., and I am not here extolling its merits. The point that the American people must understand is that you have elected a Congress, and you never elected any Supreme Court. You elected the President, too. Now, with your elected representatives, you can pass a law and then nine men, whom you did not elect and who have jobs for life, can tell you, the American people, 130,000,000 of you, that you cannot progress, that you cannot change, that you cannot keep children from working in factories, that you cannot have pensions, that you cannot have decent working

conditions; they tell you that you cannot live like human beings. This is not said in the spirit of criticising the Supreme Court—they are worthy and honorable men—but the point nevertheless arises, as a fundamental governmental problem, that these men, with an economic philosophy of 1890, or 40 or 50 years ago, tell us how and what we must do. Considering this from the viewpoint of political science, the question is whether or not that character of system is suitable to the American people.

It seems to me that the effect of the Supreme Court's decision is that we are legally ordered, 130,000,000 of us, by 9 men, to go into social disintegration.

Let us now pass to the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, in my opinion, is now the most important issue before the American people. I talked of the N. R. A., because some people seem to think that decision may have some bearing on the Tennessee Valley Authority, but competent lawyers tell me, and I think it is correct, that there is no similarity in the legal questions whatever. Be that as it may, the T. V. A. is the one big issue before the American people, although many of them do not realize it. The issue concerning T. V. A.—and T. V. A. is the turning point—is whether or not the American people are to have a right to enjoy the things which they already own.

Now, let us talk plainly about the Tennessee Valley Authority. You hear of the Government being in business and destroying private initiative and private business.

Some of it is true and some of it is untrue, but it is absolutely untrue as applied to the T. V. A. in its larger implications. Now I ask you, Could any individual private company have all this vast program of soil erosion, which is so vitally necessary, reforestation, and all the rest of those things? Do you think they could do that? And why should not the American people use their own cheap power? If the T. V. A. rates of electricity were applied to all of America, there would be a saving every year of \$791,000,000.

Now, history shows that civilization after civilization has been destroyed because people have come in, have cut the trees down, and tilled the soil, and have not conserved it, and have allowed the soil to wash away, and then would come waste and soil erosion, followed by wholesale abandonment or starvation. Precisely the same thing is happening now in the United States of America.

The western part of the United States will be a great desert unless we do something about it. The portion around the Tennessee Valley Authority will wash away.

Oh, yes, sure, let the Government get out of business. Oh, sure, get the Government out of business! That's the thing. But how in the world are we going to save our own country, except through the cooperation of the American people; through the agency of their own Government? You know, I always sort of smile when people knock our Government. That old propaganda of the inefficiency and graft in government has gone on for years and years so certain speculative groups can exploit the American people. And that's all there is to it. Everybody ought to know that. And so let us look at this thing intelligently, in a governmental sense, from a true viewpoint. Government is supposed to be of and by the people—although it may not be—and, of course, we ought to try to make it that way.

When government is for the few, it is when the government does not let the people develop themselves, and protects a few people in the making of money, leaving the large bulk of the people as more or less peons or serfs of the few who are speculating and exploiting these large masses of the people. Now, that may sound bad to you, it may sound what they call "socialistic", or something of that kind. But I must tell you that it is just plain common sense.

You go down into the Tennessee Valley and here is what you see: You see a beautiful new town of small but well-designed homes, entirely electrically operated, even with electrical heat. You see one of the finest school systems in this new town, where children can enjoy the very best of education. You see fine roads; you see men at work building one of the largest dams in the history of this country; a dam 250 feet high and a thousand feet wide across a great canyon,

building it with great machinery at the lowest cost known in dam construction in this country.

You see these men receiving high wages and enjoying the best of living conditions. You see a whole great valley being rejuvenated; floods being prevented; you see the water of this great public stream being used, not for private speculation of the few but to generate power to be made available in every home and factory through this great area, and made available at prices which do not include the high cost of financial skulduggery and those dizzy pyramids that Mr. Insull taught his associates to build. All of this is going on right here in the United States. All of it is being done by your own Government, and you naturally ask: "Well, if these fine living conditions can be had, and this preservation of natural resources can be done in the Tennessee Valley, why cannot it be done all over the United States? In Indiana, in California, in Montana, and Kansas, or Maryland?" The answer is: "It can be." There is no reason why the higher standards of living, the comfort, the conveniences, the high wages, the preservation of natural resources, which is being carried on in this project in the Tennessee Valley through your Government, your own Government, cannot be done equally well in your congressional district, mine, anywhere in the country, or wherever the streams are washing away our natural resources.

That is what this great cooperative unit in the Tennessee Valley is all about. It is an effort to show that the American people have the ingenuity, have the courage and the ability, have the technical resources, have the will to establish a standard of living that is consistent with American ideals. And I repeat: What is being done in the Tennessee Valley can be done in every part of this country. But it cannot be done if you let the utility crowd, the coal outfits, and the other special private interests destroy this first unit in establishing a real American standard of living for America. If they do not stop T. V. A., there is nothing that can prevent our people having these same benefits.

Now get this point: Think of this as one great war, one big battle. We have one point that must be protected, or at least one battle line that we cannot let go, and that is T. V. A. If we lose that battle, we lose all the rest. If T. V. A. is licked, Grand Coulee and Boulder Dams are licked. So is Caspar Alcova, Bonneville Dams and many others all over the United States.

If T. V. A. is beaten, so is any program to protect all the farms of the Middle West. If the T. V. A. is defeated, the hopes of the Wabash Valley and all the people of Illinois and Indiana will be dashed to pieces. You know about Fort Peck, out in Montana. Well, of course, that will go by the boards, too. What about the Missouri Valley? It will be lost. What about the whole Mississippi Valley? The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if the T. V. A. is defeated, then the whole program of national conservation, the whole program of saving this country for itself and future generations will be lost. It seems to me the T. V. A. is absolutely the most important piece of legislation and the most important endeavor before the American people today. You might as well expect a human body to live with its head cut off as to expect any plan of conservation to succeed with this great measure defeated.

The whole point is, Have the American people the right to own what is already theirs? Have you and I and all of the people a right to use the light of the stars at night, the heat of the sun in the day, the rivers, the water, the energies, and forces of nature which God gave us, or are these to be used by only a few to exploit the whole American people? Everyone admits that there are enough natural resources in this country to feed and clothe 10 times as many people as we now have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to leave two vital thoughts with you:

First. The time has arrived when we, the Members of Congress, and all the American people, must give thorough consideration to our whole political system and its relations to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Second. That the T. V. A. must be allowed to succeed if the people are to preserve their own rights and to be allowed to progress and save their own country.

There is no short-cut to prosperity and economic and social justice. To attain these requires clear-eyed thinking and courage to act. We of Congress—a part of the 130,000,000 Americans—face both these tests today, and unless we meet them great will be our loss.

THE NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the Natchez Trace Parkway, and to include a short address delivered by the Honorable Jeff Busby, a former Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the Natchez Trace Parkway, which was outlined in a bill that was before the last Congress to construct a parkway along the route of the old Natchez Trace, leading from Nashville to Natchez in Mississippi, has progressed to the point where the survey has been completed, under the authority of the Busby bill passed by the last Congress. The complete plan of this survey for the construction of the parkway will be available, I am informed, in a few days.

I appeared on March 5, 1934, before the Roads Committee of the House in favor of the bills H. R. 7312, to provide \$50,000 with which to make the survey, and H. R. 7345, to provide \$25,000,000 with which to construct the Natchez Trace Parkway. I introduced a map in those hearings covering the portion of Tennessee through which the parkway is to be built. It passes through Maury, Lewis, and Wayne Counties in my district. The people of my district are greatly interested in the construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway. From a national standpoint, this project is necessary, and it is my purpose to direct the attention of Congress, in every way I can, to the importance of the early completion of this work.

In a Natchez Trace Parkway celebration, held the 19th of July 1934, which was attended by a number of people from Nashville, as well as from my section of Tennessee, an address was delivered by former Congressman Jeff Busby, author of the bills proposing the parkway. Because that address was filled with so much information which should be available to everyone, I am extending it in my remarks:

We are gathered today to further a cause begun more than a century ago. We have come here, on this occasion, a united force, to plan the consummation of a work undertaken by our forefathers in the early days of our Republic. The Natchez Trace was one of the most ancient and useful Indian roads found in the new country by the early settlers. It was from the vicinity of your fair city that the warlike tribe for which it is named—the Natchez—sallied forth over this trail under the leadership of their chief ruler, called the "Great Sun", to strike terror among the neighboring Indian tribes. This Indian trail, the Natchez Trace, was the chief overland route used by immigrants of every class in coming to the new country. We are told they came by the thousands, all sorts and conditions of men, mountaineers from the Blue Ridge and the Yadkin Valley, pack peddlers, traders, Army men, disgruntled soldiers, original settlers of Tennessee composed of a large number who had fought in the Revolution, farm boys, city men, men of all trades, carpenters, hostlers, mechanics, men embittered seeking solitude—Aaron Burr, John Fitch, Fannie Wright, and Robert Owens seeking Utopia; proud, fearless men and men with heavy secrets to conceal, desperadoes flying from justice, suspected or convicted felons escaped from the grasp of the law, the horse thief, the counterfeiter, and the robber. By water and by land they came, hammering their way into the wilderness, pushing on toward the scented river, the dreamed-of Mississippi that lay like a liquid spine in the wilderness' midst. There also came the leaders in culture, refinement, and education from New England and the East, from Pennsylvania and Virginia, the oldest and best families of every section. So rapid was the migration to Mississippi, the chief settlement being about Natchez, that the population increased from 8,850 in 1800 to 40,352 in 1810, and 75,448 by 1820.

THREE PERIODS OF NATIONAL ROAD BUILDING

Road building has passed through three periods in the United States. The first was in the early days of the Republic when the only two modes of travel were by water and over land. Rivers and streams furnished an easy means of travel while going downstream, but a very laborious one when the traveler was going upstream. This of necessity required the development of land routes,

and roads better than the Indian trails. During this period, which extended from the earliest days of the settlements to about 1830, the Congress of the United States undertook a number of road improvement projects and in some instances authorized the President to lay out, open, and make convenient wagon roads for long distances.

The second period, or policy of the Government toward road building, came about 1830 with the coming of the steam engine and railroad transportation. The interest of the Government in road building during that time, from 1830 to about 1910, drifted to a low level. It donated millions in land and money to railroad building, but nothing to the construction of highways. Poor systems of highways, if such roads as existed then could be called highways, were developed locally, over which the farmer drove his horse or mule team, and in some sections of the country his slow-moving ox team to the railroad station to market.

The third period, or policy of the Government toward highway construction, has been forced by necessity with the coming of the automobile and motor power. The Federal Highway Act was passed by Congress in 1916, and since that time there has been a gradual broadening of the Federal policy toward highway construction. President Roosevelt said recently when signing the \$400,000,000 road bill "As long as the roads of the Nation are used by more than 24,000,000 automobiles and trucks, construction and improvement of roads will be of major importance." It is no longer expected that the farmers along the routes shall supply the funds with which to construct the links in a national highway system. They now find themselves heavily burdened with bonds because of their early efforts to do this. Three-fourths of the people live in cities, and pay little or no ad valorem tax for road building. Nine-tenths of the income of the Nation is in the cities. It is but just and fair that the Federal Treasury contribute liberally to national highway building. One thing we have woefully lacked—proper planning of a national highway system. It has been said that our roads "start nowhere and go nowhere." Local politics has often done much to divert roads from proper locations. With the Federal Government supervising, these mistakes will be largely avoided.

In the year 1806 the Congress of the United States passed an act which was approved on April 21, authorizing President Jefferson to lay out and open a road from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez, Miss. The particular part of that act pertaining to the establishment of this road is in section 7, and reads as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to cause to be opened a road from Nashville, in the State of Tennessee, to Natchez, in the Mississippi Territory: *Provided*, He shall not expend more than \$6,000 in opening the same."

This appropriation was followed by another appropriation of \$3,000 in 1809, which sums were used to convert the old Natchez Trace from an Indian foot-and-bridle path into a usable wagon road. Thus the ancient trail leading from the section about Nashville was established as a national highway connecting the white settlements of Tennessee, Kentucky, and the East with the white settlements that had sprung up in the Spanish, French, and later in the English territory on the lower Mississippi.

At this period of our Nation's history white settlements were rapidly developing in different parts of the southern territory being acquired by the United States from other nations. The obstacles in development lay in the fact that accessibility between the several parts of the country was difficult because there were no roads. Rivers and streams were largely depended upon, and along them white settlements first sprang up. To a certain extent Indian trails were utilized, and some of the most important of them were converted by the Government into wagon roads.

Realizing the importance of the Natchez Trace leading through the lands of the Chickasaws, in 1801 a treaty was entered into between the United States and the Chickasaw Indians, who occupied the southern part of Tennessee and the northeastern part of Mississippi, in which treaty it is provided that the Chickasaws " . . . give leave and permission to the President of the United States of America to lay out, open, and make a convenient wagon road through their land between the settlements of Mero District, in the State of Tennessee, and those of Natchez, in the Mississippi Territory, in such a way and manner as he may deem proper, and the same shall be a highway for the citizens of the United States and the Chickasaws."

In the same year a treaty was entered into at Fort Adams between the United States and the Choctaw Indians, whose territory lay just south of that of the Chickasaws, in which treaty it was provided that the Choctaws " . . . do hereby give their free consent that a durable and convenient wagon road may be explored, marked, opened, and made under the orders and instructions of the President of the United States through their lands, to commence at the northern extremity of the settlements of the Mississippi Territory, and to be extended from thence, by such route as may be selected and surveyed under the authority of the President of the United States, until it shall strike the lands claimed by the Chickasaw Nation; and the same shall be and continue forever for the citizens of the United States and the Choctaws."

Natchez Trace Road was secured, and the basis for the action of Congress in 1806 was laid for the establishment and construction of a wagon road by the United States between Nashville, Tenn., and Natchez, Miss. Along this roadway, established by the Government, and used throughout its length by the citizens of the United States and the Indians, much history was made by the

pioneers; taverns were established, stagecoaches were operated, and many are the stories of bravery, chivalry, violence, and crime told even today of the happenings along this road of some 500 miles in length. It was over this road that part of Jackson's forces traveled from Nashville to New Orleans, and it was over this road that Jackson returned with his army from New Orleans to Nashville after his famous victory where he so overwhelmingly defeated the British in the last battle of the War of 1812.

Much history has been compiled concerning the Indian trails which were used prior to the coming of the white man. In the Forty-second Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, published by the Smithsonian Institution, at page 811, is an article headed "The Natchez Trace." It begins: "When the whites first came into middle Tennessee they found an Indian path or trace running from the former Indian settlements around Nashville to the Chickasaw towns about Pontotoc in northern Mississippi, where it connected with trails leading to all sections of the southern United States. The middle Tennessee whites called it the 'Chickasaw Trace' because it went to the Chickasaw towns, but later it was known as the 'Natchez Trace.'"

NATCHEZ TRACE CONNECTS PARTS OF UNITED STATES

This same article further recites concerning this trace that it was regarded by our early whites as being ancient, and was spoken of by them as the old Chickasaw Trace. Its route was the logical one for movements between large and important sections in the central United States. Over it, beyond question, passed in later times parties of Chickasaw, Choctaw, Natchez, and other southern tribes on their way to middle Tennessee, Kentucky, and the territory of our present North Central States, while the many unknown peoples who preceded them must also have traveled it. Its key situation forced its use, and it played a vital part in the life of the region, both in war and in peace.

When settlements began to spring up in different parts of the country, mostly along rivers and watercourses, because they could be used as a means of transportation, it also became apparent to the settlers that the land routes to connect these settlements must be planned and developed.

The white man began using this trail as soon as he came into the region. Over it passed many southern Indian war parties to attack the feeble white settlement in Tennessee, and over it in return hurried armed white bands to attack and destroy their red enemies south of the Tennessee River.

As the number of white settlers increased and their land and water traffic grew, Natchez, in the Mississippi territory, became of more and more importance. The whites floated their products to Natchez or beyond, but many of them preferred to return by land over the old Chickasaw Trace and its connections rather than by the long and laborious upstream pull-and-push-against-the-current journey by river. The newly formed United States Government very soon began to realize the possibilities of this great southern section and planned to open better means of communication through it.

Thus, the celebrated Natchez Trace was established. It followed substantially the route of the Chickasaw Trace and its connections, departing therefrom only where the necessities of a wagon road varied from the requirements of aboriginal foot travel or where the newly formed settlements of the whites drew it slightly from its ancient course.

Park Marshall, a well-known historian of Tennessee, writing on the Natchez Trace, states: "General Wilkinson (who supervised the laying out of the road under President Jefferson) is reported as saying to the Indians, 'The Chickasaw Trail is a very uncomfortable road and we wish to improve it for the use of both the Indians and the white people.'"

Mr. Marshall also states: "I have looked upon the Chickasaw Trail as a route or path leading from the main villages of the Chickasaws in what is now Pontotoc County, Miss., to the vicinity of Nashville. The trail crossed the Tennessee at the northwest corner of Alabama, close to the mouth of the Big Bear Creek. It was planned for the Natchez Trace to cross at the same place, but the officers in charge (Captain Butler and Lt. E. Pendleton Gaines), perhaps with the consent of General Wilkinson, were persuaded to cross it 1 or 2 miles above, at Colberts Ferry."

ROUTE OF THE NATCHEZ TRACE

The old Chickasaw Trace and later the Natchez Trace passed from Nashville through the following points in Tennessee: Near Bellevue, Davidson County; near Leipers Fork, in Williamson County; near Leatherwood, in Maury County; through Gordonsburg, in Lewis County; near Victory, in Wayne County. It then passed into Alabama. At or near Dart, in Lauderdale County, the Natchez Trace left the old Chickasaw Trace in order to cross the Tennessee about 2½ miles downstream from Colberts. The Natchez Trace joined the old Chickasaw Trace near Alsboro, in Colbert County, and thence passed into the State of Mississippi, where it went through Tishomingo, Saltillo, and on to the mass of Indian trails and Chickasaw towns in Pontotoc County. Here the old Tennessee Chickasaw Trace ended, but it connected with other Indian trails leading to all parts of the southern United States.

THE ROUTE FROM PONTOTOC TO NATCHEZ

Leaving the Chickasaw region in Pontotoc County, the Natchez Trace continued on to Natchez over another old Indian trail, passing through or very near the following towns: Houston, in Chickasaw County; Mathiston, in Webster County; French Camp, in Choctaw County; Kosciusko, in Attala County; Thomastown, in Leake County; Canton in Madison County; Clinton and Raymond, in

Hinds County; Port Gibson, in Claiborne County; Washington, in Adams County.

The United States mail was carried over the Natchez Trace in the years immediately following its opening. Along this trace were established many taverns for the entertainment and accommodation of foot, horseback, and stagecoach travelers.

Some years ago while making a search at the Census Bureau for certain material I came across an old atlas published in Philadelphia by Anthony Finley in 1830.

The map of Mississippi in this atlas marked very distinctly the boundaries of the Indian lands in the State. The Indian tribes then remaining in Mississippi were chiefly the Chickasaws and the Choctaws.

On this map of 1830, which was published in the time of Jackson, and only 16 years after the Battle of New Orleans, are plainly marked the leading Indian trails and wagon roads that had been developed in the State. Some of the settlements that have served as landmarks, even to the present time, were in existence then. Monroe, a missionary station, and the Chickasaw Agency near what is now Pontatoc, are noted on this map. On it the Natchez Trace passed through the Chickasaw Agency. Some few miles north of this is Longtown; to the east of these several miles on the Tombecbee River is located Cotton Gin Port; just south of it are Bolivar, Hamilton, and Columbus.

From Columbus to Columbia, both of which are noted on this map, leads the Jacksons Road; from Columbus to what is now Canton in Madison County leads the Robinson Road. It joined the Natchez Trace 7 miles northeast of the present town of Canton.

Very plainly shown is the old Natchez Road, beginning at Natchez, then passing through Washington, Seltzertown, Uniontown, Greenville (in Jefferson County), Port Gibson, Grindstone Ford; thence to Mount Satus (near Raymond); Old Agency (near Madison Station); Doaks (through the present city of Kosciusko); Pigeon Roost, Folsoms (just south of Mathiston), Underwoods (near the location of Old Cumberland); then through Houston; then Chickasaw Agency, already mentioned; Longtown, Underwood Village, which is just over the line of Mississippi into Alabama, near where the village of Alsboro now stands. From there the trail crossed Bear Creek, proceeded across the corner of Alabama, and crossed the Tennessee River to the north side to a village marked on the map, "Havana."

I wrote and introduced two bills in Congress—one providing for \$50,000 with which to make a survey of the old Indian trail known as the "Natchez Trace" with a view to constructing a national road on this route to be known as the "Natchez Trace Parkway." I have designated this "The Natchez Trace Parkway" because there is in the Department of the Interior the Division of National Park Service which can handle this Natchez Trace memorial road as a parkway better and more expeditiously than could be done through the road-building set-up. The road now being constructed from the Shenandoah National Park to the Great Smoky Mountain, a distance of about 500 miles, is under this authority. It has jurisdiction of Government parkways but does not have jurisdiction over roads or highways.

In the preamble to the bill providing funds for the survey I call attention to the fact that the Natchez Trace is located almost throughout its entire length on highlands between watersheds on the most suitable route over which to establish the national parkway through a section of the country greatly in need of such road facilities from the national standpoint to connect the North and East directly with Natchez, New Orleans, and Southwest section of the country; and that the Natchez Trace was made famous for the service it rendered in affording General Jackson a route over which much of his forces moved to take part in Jackson's famous victory over the British at New Orleans, and also by reason of the fact that General Jackson returned with his army over this trace to Nashville after the Battle of New Orleans; and that the Natchez Trace is known as one of the Nation's most famous old roads, and has been marked by handsome boulders with suitable inscriptions by the Daughters of the American Revolution at great expense, these boulders being placed every few miles from one end of the trace to the other; and that unusual interest is being manifested in the building of a national parkway by the Government, Natchez Trace organizations having been perfected in almost every county through which the trace passes. This bill has now become law, and \$50,000 is now set apart with which to make the survey, which is expected to be begun at an early date.

The second bill provided for a \$25,000,000 appropriation with which to construct the Natchez Trace Parkway along the route of the old Natchez Trace as established by Congress under the act of 1806, and as laid out and developed under that authority.

The country with poor roads is a country undeveloped, regardless of what other advantages and improvements it may have. People living close to each other remain strangers and places only a few miles away inaccessible. The most notable thing for which ancient Rome is remembered is the Appian Way, the construction of which was begun in 312 B. C. Perhaps this is the oldest and most celebrated of all great roads, because of its permanence and the grandeur of its construction. England was known for her poor roads and poor internal developments even 150 years ago. A well-constructed, permanent highway is a permanent asset of the Nation. It does not benefit the people living close to it solely; it does not belong solely to the generation living at the time of its construction. It is traveled by and becomes a benefit to the people of all the States and passes down to the succeeding generations a heritage from us who have gone before.

THE LIBRARY ANNEX

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in relation to the bills H. R. 8269 and S. 2899.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to House bill 8269 and Senate bill 2899, which are identical bills providing for the authorization of the remaining amount of money necessary to complete the Library annex. The advertisements for bids have all been received, so we now know the exact amount that will be required. This additional amount is \$2,866,340. The contracts are ready to let as soon as this amount is authorized. I am going to ask unanimous consent on next Monday, immediately after reading the Journal, to take from the Speaker's desk Senate bill 2899, which is identical to House bill 8269, and substitute it for the House bill. I am asking immediate consideration of this measure, because no contract can be let until the authority is given. If the authorization is not made before the 15th of June the appropriations already made will lapse. The Library Committee makes a unanimous report in favor of this authorization as did the Senate Library Committee, and it passed the Senate unanimously.

This additional amount is not only required but well justified. The plans for the building have all been made. The foundation is in and ready to receive the building. The increased amount over the original authorization is due to a very large advance in cost of materials and labor since the original authorization of 3 years ago as well as a slight advance caused by the substitution of marble by the Building Commission in the place of cheaper material.

COURT DICTATORSHIPS AND OLIGARCHIES

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter and telegram addressed to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Upon what subject?

Mr. TRUAX. Upon the Supreme Court decision in the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. MAPES. How long is the letter?

Mr. TRUAX. It is very short.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1933, in the House of Representatives I made the following statement:

Back in Ohio we have not only money lenders, but the State banking department has been just as ruthless in the foreclosure of mortgages as any private money lender. Three sessions of the general assembly have been held within the last 6 or 9 months, and now they are in regular session. At the opening of each session I dispatched an open letter to the Governor, calling his attention to the deplorable situation of the farmers, but they were ignored. Today an average of 500 farmers are being evicted daily by the money lenders. What we need in our legislation is to enact a law giving the President dictatorial power to declare a national moratorium against foreclosures.

Again on March 27 I urged the House of Representatives to take cognizance of the then alarming, depressing, and terrifying mortgage-foreclosure situation. I quote from my remarks:

The most pressing, the most vital issue concerning the farmers of this country and the home owners of the country today is a moratorium or suspension of foreclosures. An average of 5,000 farms and homes are confiscated daily by the money lenders of this country. We have on the way to this House this week another phase of the President's program that proposes to refinance the farms and the homes of this country. In the face of what is coming to us if we refuse to take action, are we not a party to this confiscation that is going on in the country day by day? Is it not our duty to enact legislation that will give to these people the same protection that will be given to others later on? Ten years ago I predicted the coming of a farm peasantry. Today that peasantry is here; and

Bowed by the weight of centuries, he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes?

I know the American farmer is not a hoe farmer. Nevertheless he leans heavily upon his high-priced tractors and machinery and equipment. The emptiness of certain foreclosure is in his face, and on his back the crushing burden of mortgage indebtedness that is bearing him to the ground. So I say to you, let the strong arm of the law step in today and say to these money lenders, "You shall not sell out these worthy people until they, too, by the provisions that will be made for them—through money that will be loaned to them—shall have an opportunity to work out their salvation."

That was in 1933.

It was not until June 15, 1934, however, that these supplications were answered, because it was on that day, 15 months later, that the Frazier-Lemke farm-bankruptcy bill was enacted into law. About 1 week later the bill was signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt despite the objections of the money-lending crowd made up of bankers, life-insurance companies, and other usurers.

You will note that in those remarks made on March 13, 1933, I urged that the President be given dictatorial powers to declare a moratorium or national holiday on farm foreclosures. Now, to our utter amazement, disappointment, sorrow, and resentment we find that a dictatorship just as depressing and costly has been arrogantly assumed by the Supreme Court. It is depressing and oppressing to note that this Court, and sometimes one individual of that Court, can negative and nullify the acts of the Congress of the United States, the acts of the President of the United States, the acts of Governors, and the acts of State legislatures. If this is not a dictatorship, then what is it? Most regrettable of all is that this dictatorship is sometimes used to uphold the property rights of the overprivileged, favored few. This form of supergovernment is imposed upon the people, not through any desire or wish of their own, not by representatives who are duly elected by all the people, not by those who would destroy once and for all this arrogant usurpation of authority and power but by men who govern seemingly by the divine right of kings, who can do no wrong, nor work no hardships upon the masses of our fellow men, a usurpation of power unwarranted and unjustified in any manner, shape, or form.

Here is a letter from a constituent and friend that is one of many:

THE NORTHERN OHIO LAND CO.,
Paulding, Ohio, May 27, 1935.

HON. CHARLES V. TRUAX,

Congressman at Large, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLEY: Wow! I have just heard the radio announcement of the adverse decision of the Frazier-Lemke bill.

Mein Gott und Himmel! This is awful and especially to poor, impoverished, and helplessly encumbered farmers, who will now be knocked off by the thousands to join that innumerable caravan of dispossessed.

Have you in mind some other proposal of relief for such unfortunates that can be enacted without unnecessary delay?

Surely something constitutionally can be enacted for relief.

Your numerous friends here figure that such progressives as you will be able to protect them with some measure, and you would be surprised at the number that talk in this vein.

Have FRAZIER and LEMKE anything to offer in lieu of the old measure?

With kind regards, I beg to remain,

Yours always most respectfully,

SAMUEL T. PRICE.

To my friend Price I will say that my remarks will no doubt be of interest to you, hence I am sending you copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today.

At this point I also insert a telegram received today from a warm friend of mine who is most apprehensive of the ill effects to industry that will follow the scrapping of the N. R. A. by the Supreme Court:

GALLON, OHIO, May 27, 1935.

HON. CHARLES TRUAX,

House of Representatives:

We trust you will use your influence to extend the N. R. A. at least 2 years. To extend it only 10 months would be worse than nothing at all. It would keep industry unsettled. It would create disrespect, and would increase noncompliance with present code. The N. R. A. has stabilized our industry; increased our employment; been helpful to small manufacturers. For God's sake don't return us to the cutthroat day of 1932. Don't let the chiseler deceive you. The nonpolitical manufacturers desire and will comply with codes of fair competition.

L. M. LIGGETT,

President Gallon Metallic Vault Co.

In my remarks today I am not addressing myself to the status of the N. R. A. under the Supreme Court ruling. That will be taken care of later.

The framers of the Constitution in their day and time gazed upon a country that was new. It was young. It was well started on the onward path of progress. Ninety-eight percent of its citizens lived upon the farms. They tilled the soil. They lived simply and frugally. They lived not in the time of the airplane, steam transportation, the automobile, the radio, nor the racketeering bankers, swashbuckling plutocrats, shylocking money lenders, nor bloodthirsty 36-percent loan sharks. Mortgages were the exception and not the rule. Foreclosures were unheard of, undreamed of. At last the sons and daughter of a new-born republic had cast off the shackles of monarchical tyranny and depression, had gazed upon the blazing sun of freedom and liberty, both for their country and for their economic selves, had been led out of the valleys of special privilege and property rights as dominated and directed by the Tories of their mother country, England, up to the mountain tops of justice and equality for all under American standards and concepts.

A constitution was then needed for this new republic so that it might wisely and sanely build its future and to posterity so that here might be the one country in the whole world that might say to its citizenry, "Go forth, seek your fortunes and guarantee your destinies secure in the knowledge that the same privileges and protection will be extended with equal force and application to all."

When the United States was embroiled in the World War as Woodrow Wilson pointed out to make the world safe for democracy, it was not the people's wishes which put us into the war nor was it the dictum of the Supreme Court. It was the act of Congress of the United States. Following that titanic struggle which cost us billions of dollars and many thousands of human lives, the farmer exerted herculean struggles to produce as he had never produced before. American food coupled with American youth, brawn, courage, and energy won the war, not to make the world safe for democracy but as was afterward proved to make it safe for Wall Street plutocracy.

The vested interests were protected as they always were protected by Congress and the courts. They said that there was nothing too good for the soldier when he returned from the war, and that is exactly what he has received—nothing.

The farmer plunged into an economic tailspin, forced there by the Federal Reserve Board, Andy Mellon, and his fellow Wall Street buccaneers. President Roosevelt possessed the honesty of purpose and the courage necessary to sponsor legislation that after 15 years at last placed the farmer in the circle of protected industries by government. The Seventy-third Congress were the possessors of the will and the intestinal fortitude to declare a mortgage foreclosure holiday and to enact into law the Frazier-Lemke bankruptcy bill.

Now along comes the United States Supreme Court, a tribunal of justice, a bench of justice, occupied by nine men appointed by the Presidents of the United States, serving during good behavior, drawing salaries of \$20,000 per year, now about to be housed in a \$10,000,000 palatial edifice paid for by taxpayers' money—taxpayers, the larger portion of which have no decent incomes, no appreciable property or wealth, taxpayers who are hounded from the cradle to the grave by obnoxious sales taxes, pernicious real-estate taxes, avaricious 36-percent loan sharks and money lenders.

The past 6 years have witnessed the most terrific saturnalia of mortgage foreclosures ever recorded in the annals of American history. The legislatures of many States called a halt upon the money lenders' predatory operations; they enacted moratorium laws; the Congress of the United States heeded the call of an outraged and terrified farm citizenry; the President of the United States turned not a deaf ear to the pleadings of those who were being dispossessed. It remained for the Supreme Court of the United States, this avowed tribunal of justice and economic liberty, to negative these humanitarian acts of Congress, of the President of the United States, of the Governors, and of State legislatures, by

saying, "No; it cannot be done; the Constitution is a sacred, holy thing; it must be preserved at all costs." Property rights must be sustained. Shylocks must have their pound of flesh. The sword of Damocles that ever hangs over the farmer's head by a slender thread must be perpetuated by the now decreed constitutionality and legality of deficiency judgments.

The question naturally arises in the hearts and minds of these tillers of the soil who now see themselves slipping back into the strangling clutches of money lenders: Can any tribunal be liberal, be fair and just and human, on \$20,000 a year for life?

We hear much that it is unconstitutional to confiscate property without due process of law. Is it due process of law to take away a man's farm simply because forces beyond his control have beaten down his prices to a level that will not pay taxes or expenses? Is it due process of law to say that a farm shall be confiscated by the money lender simply because there is not money enough in the country? Is it due process of law to force 20,000,000 American citizens on relief rolls or doles simply because there are too many billionaires and too many paupers? Is it due process of law to permit insurance companies and others to steal unemployed workmen's homes because of an iniquitous, vicious monetary and currency system directed and controlled by the private bankers of the Federal Reserve System? No; it is nothing more than the same old moth-eaten worn-out argument used for decades and generations to distinguish the line between the rich and the poor, between the special privileged and the working classes, between property rights and human rights.

The question is, How much longer will an ever-suffering and constantly increasing penniless citizenry stand for this sort of dictatorial usurpation of power and ruthless exploitation and domination by a court oligarchy functioning apparently for those upon whom fortune has smiled abundantly?

I doubt seriously that the lawyers who sit on this highest of tribunals would have been as coldly legalistic in their mental and judicial processes had their economic conditions and needs been the same as those 20,000,000 sufferers who cry for food and raiment and shelter, as those 11,000,000 men who tramp the streets looking for jobs that are nowhere to be found, as those 4,000,000 heroic soldiers who were denied their bonus so justly earned and deserved.

Fair prices for farm commodities existing today place the farmer in a much better position. All he needs is time—time to produce a good crop, to sell that crop, and apply the proceeds thereof on his mortgage. Farm rents are definitely on the upturn; the Shylocks and the money lenders know this too well. Therefore they will foreclose from now on with ruthless impunity and abandon. The Supreme Court decision now closes the door not only to a 5-year extension for more time but to those commendable efforts made to scale down debts and mortgages to actual value today.

I hesitate to prophesy what may happen in this coming mortgage-foreclosures crisis. When the mortgagor cannot pay and the mortgagee insists on his pound of flesh, perhaps some more judges will be jerked off their bench and hurried to the nearest tree as was done in the State of Iowa in 1933.

The Court says the number of dollars owed must remain constant; it cannot be changed. Like the old gold standard, it was immutable. Commodity prices and the price levels of everything generally might go to the devil, but the prices of that old god, gold, must be always the same.

Now we are told that the farmers' debt is immutable. It is fixed; it cannot be scaled down, so we are told. Throughout all the ages some philosophers have sagely remarked that there is an eternal conflict between agriculture and manufacturing industry and finance, and that in the end agriculture always goes down. This trite observation seems to be peculiarly applicable to the decision of the Supreme Court on the Frazier-Lemke bankruptcy bill.

If American agriculture must and will go down under court dictatorships and oligarchies, let the conflict be a final and conclusive one. The weapons used may be ballots or even more effective ones.

HOLDING-COMPANY PROPAGANDA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am getting such a flood of propaganda sent by the people interested in the Power Trust in opposition to the Wheeler-Rayburn bill, that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including a letter of my own, which is my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have some letters condemning some remarks that he made in reference to the Power Trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in their frantic efforts to block the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn holding company bill the power interests have resorted to every conceivable means to get letters written or telegrams sent to Senators and Members of this House protesting against the passage of this measure.

They have even resorted to coercion, and forced their employees to sign letters which they themselves have written. They have forced their employees to put these signed letters in envelopes, stamp them at their own expense, and return them to the writers unsealed, to be inspected by them before being mailed to Members of the House and Senate. That is what I call using the mails to defraud.

I had noticed sometime ago that another wave of this propaganda was coming. I was sent a copy of the instructions mailed out by one of these holding companies to its stockholders telling them just what to write their Congressmen and Senators.

To show you that they had coached their investors, not wisely but too well, letters began to pour in immediately that were not only verbatim copies of each other but were verbatim copies of suggestions contained in those instructions.

To my mind, the most cruel and inhuman phase of this movement is the fact that they had even induced their victims—the widows, the aged, and even the orphans onto whom they had unloaded their worthless watered stocks—to write their Congressmen or their Senators protesting against the passage of this measure, the purpose of which is to protect innocent investors as well as the helpless consumers of electric lights and power from these ruthless racketeers in the years to come.

To the large number of these inspired letters that have come to me from these investors in utility stocks I am sending the following reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 31, 1935.

MY DEAR —: Your communication relative to the Wheeler-Rayburn holding company bill has been received.

Evidently you have been misled by Power-Trust propaganda, both as to the conditions that render this legislation necessary and as to the objects which it is designed to accomplish.

The power companies, and especially the holding companies, have run wild in recent years, issuing what is called "watered" stocks when they knew that their values were merely speculative, based upon gambling prospects of the rankest sort, and sold them out to innocent purchasers like yourself. Now, for fear you will demand that they be brought to justice and forced to make good the representations on which you were induced to buy, they falsely represent to you that Congress is about to perpetrate an injustice on innocent investors—the very people Congress is trying to protect.

But you are not without your remedy. The power interests know that, and they use this subterfuge to keep you from demanding your rights until you are barred by the statute of limitations.

If you own common stock in an operating company, then the passage of this bill will enhance its value instead of injuring it. The power interests know that, but they don't want you to know it if they can prevent it.

If you own preferred stock in a power company or a holding company and they fail to pay you dividends, you can make them pay. If they sold you these stocks on the representation that you could get your money out of them at any time, as was done generally in Mississippi, then you can sue and make them pay

your money back, as was done in the case of *Bennett v. Mississippi Power Co.*, decided by the Supreme Court of Mississippi on April 29, 1935.

I am enclosing some material which I hope you will read carefully.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. RANKIN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 5. An act to prevent the adulteration, misbranding, and false advertising of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics in interstate, foreign, and other commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for the purposes of safeguarding the public health, preventing deceit upon the purchasing public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 11. An act to amend section 389, title 18, of the United States Code, being section 239 of the United States Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 12. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 272. An act for the relief of William Frank Lipps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 280. An act for the relief of Hazel B. Lowe, Tess H. Johnston, and Esther L. Teckmeyer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 430. An act for the relief of Anna Hathaway; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 490. An act for the relief of F. T. Wade, M. L. Dearing, E. D. Wagner, and G. M. Judd; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 578. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit citizens of Bear Lake County, Idaho, to obtain timber from Lincoln County, Wyo., for domestic purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 658. An act for the relief of K. W. Boring; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 895. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 928. An act for the relief of Rene Hooge; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1010. An act for the relief of Fred Edward Nordstrom; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1045. An act for the relief of A. Cyril Crilley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1046. An act for the relief of E. Jeanmonod; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1070. An act for the relief of William A. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1326. An act for the relief of Robert A. Dunham; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1577. An act for the relief of Skelton Mack McCray; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1604. An act to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Dan Meehan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1793. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California", approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 602); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1833. An act for the relief of W. L. Horn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1929. An act to clarify the status of the National Zoological Park; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1943. An act to prescribe the procedure and practice in condemnation proceedings brought by the United States of America, including acquisition of title and the taking of possession under declarations of taking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1949. An act authorizing the President to order David J. Fitzgerald before a retiring board for a hearing of his case and upon the findings of such board determine whether he be placed on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1960. An act for the relief of the Florida National Bank & Trust Co., a national banking corporation, as successor trustee for the estate of Phillip Ullendorff, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1973. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, to authorize the payment of a per diem in connection with naval aerial surveys and flight checking of aviation charts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1977. An act to amend the act approved February 15, 1929, entitled "An act to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for the purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2076. An act for the relief of Domenico Politano; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard, and/or the widows of such of them as may be deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2168. An act for the relief of the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2230. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a suitable site at Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, for a rear range light; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2259. An act to amend sections 966 and 971 of chapter 22 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2326. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Eagle Pass and Piedras Negras Bridge Co. a portion of the Eagle Pass Military Reservation, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2361. An act to fix the compensation of registers of district land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2364. An act relative to the retirement of certain officers and employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 2373. An act for the relief of Harry Jarrette; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2374. An act for the relief of Elliott H. Tasso and Emma Tasso; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2378. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a bequest of certain personal property of the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the widow of Ray Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2462. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Worley, Idaho, in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children in the town of Worley and county Kootenai, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2520. An act for the relief of T. D. Randall & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 2584. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever", approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2589. An act to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished conduct to Lewis Hazard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2591. An act for the relief of Lyman C. Drake; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2621. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in the construction, extension, and betterment of the high-school building at Devils Lake, N. Dak., to be available to Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2635. An act authorizing the appropriation of funds for the payment of the award in claim of Sudden & Christenson, Inc., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2638. An act to amend the law governing the leasing of unallotted Indian lands for mining purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2642. An act to incorporate The American National Theater and Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2656. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant concessions on reservoir sites and other lands in connection with Indian irrigation projects, and to lease the lands in such reserves for agricultural, grazing, or other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2738. An act to authorize the use of park property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their national jamboree; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2899. An act to provide for increasing the limit of cost for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, June 3, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 7936. A bill to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 293. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7438. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction and operation of certain bridges across the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Youghiogeny Rivers in the county of Allegheny, Pa.", approved June 4, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7221. A bill to authorize the shortening or termination of the stay in the United States of certain aliens not admitted for permanent residence, to authorize the deportation of certain aliens admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8279) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to institutions organized for the purpose of making loans for the payment of taxes on real estate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8280) prescribing prohibition of burials of the human dead at sea, and providing for proper care and disposal of same; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8281) amending the act of June 3, 1916, entitled "The National Defense Act", adding section 15½ thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8282) amending the act of June 3, 1916, entitled "The National Defense Act", adding section 16½ thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8283) to authorize the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Eau Claire, Wis., Army cots for the accommodation of an American Legion convention; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 8284) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a Government for the Territory of Hawaii", approved April 30, 1900, as amended, and known as the "Hawaiian Organic Act", by amending section 73 thereof, relating to public lands; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 8285) granting the consent of Congress to Saline County, Mo., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8286) to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI (by request): A bill (H. R. 8287) to establish an assessed valuation real property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASSINGALE: A bill (H. R. 8288) to increase the efficiency of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEVER: A bill (H. R. 8289) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; U. S. C., title 30, secs. 185, 221, 223, and 226), as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 8290) to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in the construction, extension, and betterment of the high-school and elementary-school building at Devils Lake, N. Dak., to be available to Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8291) for the relief of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8292) establishing rules for the interstate transportation of dead human bodies within the United States and the Territories and possessions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 8293) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8294) to reenact provisions of law relating to disability compensation and pensions for World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 8295) to extend further, in certain cases, the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law", approved April 1, 1932, as extended; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8296) to add certain lands to the Challis National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 8297) to amend so much of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1921, approved March 1, 1921, as relates to the printing and distribution of a revised edition of Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. Sisson: Resolution (H. Res. 234) to investigate the legislative power of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. Mansfield: Resolution (H. Res. 235) providing for additional compensation to the clerk of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, with certain restrictions; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. Ford of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 304) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to establish minimum wages in any employment, and to regulate production, industry, business, trade, and commerce to prevent unfair methods and practices therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Bacon: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) accepting the invitation of the Government of France to the United States to participate in the International Exposition of Paris—Art and Technique in Modern Life, to be held at Paris, France, in 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. Treadway: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) to terminate all trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging that Congress appropriate the sum of \$100,000 and to enact legislation for the purpose of duplicating and furnishing the State of Illinois those World War records which were destroyed in the Springfield Arsenal fire February 1924; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of Maryland, requesting that the President and the Congress of the United States station the frigate *Constellation* at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the President, the Cabinet, and the Congress of the United States to keep the United States out of foreign wars, controversies, and entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to eliminate the long-and-short-haul clause from the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, endorsing the proposed boulevard from the city of Washington to the battlefield of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, endorsing the proposed Centenary Planning and Building Commission of the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, requesting the Congress to appropriate promptly a sufficient sum to provide for an immediate and thorough biological and practical survey of the Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, etc.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Carlson: A bill (H. R. 8298) granting a pension to Martha Breakey Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Chandler: A bill (H. R. 8299) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Annie May Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. Green: A bill (H. R. 8300) to authorize a preliminary examination of Suwannee River, in the State of

Florida, from Florida-Georgia State line to the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. Guyer: A bill (H. R. 8301) to authorize a supplemental examination of the Marais des Cygnes River, in the State of Kansas, with a view to the control of their floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. Halleck: A bill (H. R. 8302) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morehead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Higgins of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8303) granting a pension to Vernon E. Buell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. Hull: A bill (H. R. 8304) granting a pension to Carrie Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Millard: A bill (H. R. 8305) for the relief of Arthur C. Knox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. Randolph: A bill (H. R. 8306) granting increase of pension to Laura B. Strider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. Snyder: A bill (H. R. 8307) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Inks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Turner: A bill (H. R. 8308) for the relief of Claude Almon Fox; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8660. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Louisiana-Arkansas Refiners Association, Shreveport, La.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8661. Also, petition of the committee of the toilet-goods industry, New York City; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8662. By Mr. Boylan: Letter from the members of the United Upholsterers' Union of New York, Local No. 44, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8663. By Mr. Rudd: Petition of the United Upholsterers' Union, Local 44, New York City, concerning the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8664. By Mr. Dobbins: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, advocating the issuance of a special commemorative stamp in honor of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary (on July 9, 1935) of the completion of Commodore John Barry's services with the American Revolutionary Forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8665. Also, resolution by the Illinois legislative committee, acting pursuant to appointment by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging Congress to appropriate the sum of \$100,000, and the supplementary legislation necessary for the purpose of duplicating and furnishing to the State of Illinois records of Illinois veterans in the World War, to replace those destroyed by the burning of the Springfield Arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8666. By Mr. Healey: Resolution of the second interstate assembly of the American Legislators' Association, urging the Members of Congress to support the proposed appropriation of \$40,000 to the Interstate Reference Bureau for the current year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8667. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress for the enactment of Federal legislation to substitute another tax for the discriminatory tax on cigarettes selling at a low price, and that Congress is hereby requested to repeal the present unfair and discriminatory tax burden, and to impose, in lieu of the present tax, levied according to volume, of \$3 per thousand cigarettes, or 6 cents per package of 20, regardless of the selling price of the same, a tax of \$2.70 per thousand on 10-cent cigarettes, or \$3 per thousand on 15-cent cigarettes, and of \$3.30 per thousand on higher-priced cigarettes, as provided in pending Federal legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury having recommended such change in tax and hav-

ing stated that it would protect and maintain Federal revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8668. By Mr. KING: Petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress to pass legislation enabling the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue flood-control bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

8669. Also, petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress to amend section 202 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, approved July 9, 1921, relating to the membership of the commission and the appointment of officers; to the Committee on the Territories.

8670. Also, petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress to enact legislation to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to provide for the issuance of certain bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

8671. Also, petition of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii", approved April 30, 1900, as amended, and known as the Hawaiian Organic Act, by amending section 73 thereof, relating to public lands; to the Committee on the Territories.

8672. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition signed by John W. Denver and 57 others, requesting passage of House Joint Resolution No. 219; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8673. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Detroit Regional Advisory Committee to Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, urging an increase in appropriation to carry on work of the Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 31, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Ashurst	Copeland	Lewis	Russell
Austin	Costigan	Logan	Schall
Bachman	Couzens	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Dickinson	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dieterich	McCarran	Shipstead
Barbour	Donahay	McGill	Smith
Barkley	Duffy	McKellar	Steiwer
Black	Fletcher	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Frazier	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Borah	George	Metcalf	Townsend
Brown	Gerry	Minton	Trammell
Bulkley	Gibson	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Glass	Neely	Tydings
Burke	Guffey	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hale	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Harrison	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hastings	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hatch	Overtown	Wheeler
Carey	Hayden	Pittman	White
Chavez	Johnson	Pope	
Clark	Keyes	Radcliffe	
Connally	King	Reynolds	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT ON CRUDE PHOSPHATE AND SUPERPHOSPHATE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, in compliance with Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-second Congress, a report of an investigation with respect to phosphates, crude, and superphosphate, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ELECTRIC RATE SURVEY—STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a compilation, completed through the Electric Rate Survey, of the domestic and residential rates in effect in the State of Rhode Island on January 1, 1935, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1609. An act for the relief of the present leaders of the United States Navy Band and the band of the United States Marine Corps; and

S. 2899. An act to provide for increasing the limit of cost for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CARY, Mr. UMSTEAD, Mr. THOM, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. MCLEOD, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Senate joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 4688 which proposes to aid in the rehabilitation of employable blind persons in the United States and urging the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives to expedite consideration favorable to said bill

Whereas during recent times there has been a great deal of public interest and discussion on the part of social and welfare organizations and individuals of the necessity to enact immediate legislation for the purpose of rehabilitating employable blind persons in the United States; and

Whereas the problem of the blind and the training thereof for fitness to find lucrative employment in the trades and professions has long challenged resourcefulness of agencies engaged in bettering the conditions of the blind; and

Whereas on January 24, 1935, there was introduced in the House of Representatives by JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, a bill known as H. R. 4688 which has as its purpose "to rehabilitate employable blind persons in the United States by permitting them to operate news stands in the Federal buildings, to find other suitable stand locations and to make a national survey of industries wherein blind persons can be employed, and to train, place, and advise blind persons in such job"; and

Whereas there is now no form of employment as suitable and as satisfactory for blind persons which enables such persons to approach a normal economic status as the operation of news stands in Federal buildings; and

Whereas Federal and State agencies are now assisting which are capable of administering this humanitarian project: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and Congress of the United States are respectfully urged to enact legislation proposed by H. R. 4688, and that the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives